00110735

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 31 October, 2019

EWALD'S

HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

VOL. VIII.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

THE

HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

BY

HEINRICH EWALD,

Late Professor of the University of Göttingen.

110735

VOL. VIII.

The Post-Apostolic Age.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY

J. FREDERICK SMITH.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1886.

PREFACE.

WITH this volume the English translation of Ewald's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* is completed. Since 1868, the date of the edition translated, very valuable MSS. of books dating from the period reviewed in this volume have come to light, and it has been thought advisable to indicate the chief of them in notes within *square* brackets.

Students of Ewald's History will be glad to see that the Publishers have included in the present volume a complete General Index to the entire work, which is really an Encyclopædia of Biblical Learning.

J. F. S.

CONTENTS

OF

THE EIGHTH VOLUME.

BOOK VIII.

THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE.

The Third and Last of the Three Final Stages of the History.

THE PERIOD FROM THE SECOND DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM UNTIL THE CLOSE OF THE LAST JUDEAN WARS, OR THE FIRST MATURED FRUIT OF THE GERM OF THE CONSUMMATION.

PAGE

The Ultimate Issues of the Entire History of Israel 1
The Stages of this Period 9
The Sources of the History of this Period 11

I. THE FIRST EFFORTS OF THE JUDEANS TO RECOVER THEMSELVES; THE TIME OF THE FLAVIAN EMPERORS.

1. The New Relation to the Romans 15
The New Mutual Relations of Christians and Judeans . . 21

2. The New Judean Schools 27
The Talmudists 36
The Poetry and Prophecy of the New Period 45
The Fourth Book of Ezra and the Second Book of Baruch . 45
The Historical Literature of the Judeans 61
Josephus as the Apologist of his Nation 67

3. The Public Events under the Flavian Dynasty . . . 75
The Condition of the Samaritans 81
Simon Magus and other Samaritan Gnostics . . . 83
Dositheus and other Teachers of the Samaritan Community . 92

THE PERIOD FROM THE SECOND DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM—*continued.*

II. THE SEPARATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF CHRISTIANITY DURING THESE SIXTY OR SEVENTY YEARS.

	PAGE
The New Freedom and New Duties of the Period	98
General Characteristics of the Christians of these years	102
1. The Final Form of Christian Ideas and Hopes	107
(1.) The Relation of the New Religion to the Old	107
The so-called Epistle of Barnabas	108
The Dangers and Errors connected with the Use of Allegory in the Church	114
(2.) Retrogression in various respects, and Resistance to it	118
a. The Revived Efforts of the Disciples of John	119
Elkesâi	119
b. Errors arising from the Freedom of the Church	127
The Gnosis of the Period	130
Refutation of the Gnostics.—The Epistle of Jude	138
c. The New Thought and Learning of the Jewish Christians	143
The Life and Writings of the Apostle John	153
The Results of the Conflict with the New Errors.—The Fundamental Principles of the Genuine Progressive Church	170
The Epistle to Diognetus	173
(3.) The Final Form of Christian Hope	175
The Second Epistle of Peter	180
2. The Final Form of the Christian Church	185
(1.) The Dissolution of the Parent Church.—The Later Relatives of the Lord	185
The Idea of the Church in the 'Epistle to the Ephesians'	190
(2.) The Government of the individual Churches and their Institutions.—The Three Pastoral Epistles	196
The Permanence of the Offices of the Churches.—The Epistles of Clement and Polycarp	205
(3.) The Episcopal Office.—The Martyrdom and Epistles of Ignatius	215
3. The Final Form of the Relation of the Church to the World	223
Persecutions from the Heathen; and the Martyrs	223
The Shepherd of Hermas	232
Conclusion	240
The Literary Activity of the Church	241
Historical Works.—Epistles	243
The *Eclogæ* of Xystus	247
Christian Prophetic Writings	250

III. THE FINAL DESTRUCTION OF ISRAEL AS A NATION, AND THE IMPERISHABLE OUTCOME OF ITS LIFE.

1. The Situation after the Fall of the Flavian Dynasty	259
Rabbi Akiba	261
The Conversion of the Heathen.—Aquila's Translation of the Bible	266
The New Sanguinary Risings	271
2. Bar-Kôkheba and his Reign	276
The Immediate and the more Remote Consequences of the War to the Judeans	292
The Altered Position of Christianity	301
3. The End of the Entire History of Israel	304

PAGE

THE HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION OF SACRED SCRIPTURES . . 312

1. The Work which First Acquired Sacredness.—The Book of Sacred History and Law 319
The Canon.—The Samaritan Pentateuch 322
2. The Double Addition to the Judean Canon 325
The Canon of Nehemiah 325
The Canon of the Maccabees 331
Variations.—Hellenistic Canon 338
3. The New Testament Canon 346
Final Settlement of the Canon amongst the Samaritans, Judeans, and Christians 360

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY FROM THE BIRTH OF CHRIST . . . 366

INDEX 369

Errata.

Page 64 for *Nicharcus* read *Nicarchus.*

Pages 146 and 152, for *Nazarites* read *Nazarenes.*

HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

BOOK VIII.

THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE.

THE CONTACT OF ISRAEL WITH THE DIRECT ROMAN RULE IN PALESTINE.

THE THIRD AND LAST STAGE OF THE THIRD AND LAST ADVANCE OF THE FINAL PHASE OF THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL, BEING THE YEARS FROM THE SECOND DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM TO THE CLOSE OF THE LAST JUDEAN WARS, IN WHICH WAS DEVELOPED THE FIRST MATURED FRUIT OF THE GERM OF THE CONSUMMATION.

The Issues of the entire History of Israel.

THE great rebellion against the whole power of Rome on the part of the Judeans, collected around their ancient and august Sanctuary—notwithstanding that it was at first successful—had at length been put down; the Sanctuary and Jerusalem had been laid in ruins, the people of the ancient true religion, shortly before either so highly honoured or so greatly feared in the world, had been suddenly basely degraded. These catastrophes, and all the other terrible and unexpected calamities connected with the final disasters that befell this nation, had now at last really brought about the great final crisis, towards which all the long history of the nation had been tending during the growing complications of its closing period. This final crisis was necessarily so terrible in its appearance, and so overwhelming in its visible consequences, because such a vast amount of Roman, and still more of Judean infatuation, obduracy, and serious mistakes of all kinds had accumulated,

that nothing else remained than the most destructive collision of the claims and demands which had on both sides been equally exorbitant and absolute, as well as mutually incompatible; and His voice had to speak in tones of thunder whose lighter and gentler words none would hear, though they had long been audible enough. And in reality the necessity of this decisive crisis was involved, long before it thus shook the hearts of men as by the thunder of the world's Judge, in all that had mysteriously taken place in the bosom of the ancient Community and had silently developed there, far from the noise of the world, since the rise of Christianity, and, in fact, since the restoration of Jerusalem six centuries previously.

For even as early as the first destruction of Jerusalem and the first great dispersion of Israel, the true religion, as we have seen,[1] exhibited a strong inclination to take its way among the Heathen generally, and to become the salvation of all men without distinction. Thus early it had learnt to exist for a considerable time without the protection of any definite native country and special Sanctuary, and six hundred years before the period under review it had been doubtful whether a Temple should be rebuilt on the ancient sacred soil.[2] The superabundant inward power of the true religion, as it had been acquiring strength in this nation from the time of Moses, and which could be acquired in such maturity in this nation only, tended at the very beginning of this third general phase of the national history to break through the narrow confines of its home. It was only because it was at that time insufficiently matured in all respects, and still lacked its full perfection, that this powerful tendency was for the time forcibly repressed, although it could not be completely destroyed. Once more the Temple was built on the ancient sacred soil, and all sacred national institutions once more received new life around its sacred hill. In the course of the next six centuries the restored ancient institutions and traditions received a more and more stereotyped form in connection with a revived national existence; but inasmuch as the tendency to break through the old national restrictions remained nevertheless indestructible, and was further developed in a peculiar manner, an internal contradiction and schism arose in the Community of the ancient

[1] Vol. v. pp. 27 sq.

[2] As we are justified in concluding from the incidental remark of the Great Anonymous 'Isa.' lxvi. 1; as there were then difficulties in the way of the rebuilding of the Temple (see vol. v. pp. 100 sq.) this prophet justly thought that it might very well be left undone; comp. vol. iii. pp. 130 sq.; vii. p. 161.

true religion, which the Hagiocracy sought in vain to conceal. If, therefore, the ancient nationality of Israel had at the time before us been most completely broken up, the Temple destroyed, and with it all the glory and also all the vain expectations of the true religion in its national form laid in the dust, just when the Hagiocracy was determined most obstinately to maintain its place in it and in alliance with it attack the world, with all this nothing had occurred that had not been on the point of taking place from the very beginning of this protracted phase of Israel's history; and in the midst of the vast general distress, and notwithstanding the resistance and infatuation of the Hagiocracy, the essential spirit of the true religion had been delivered from the repressive limitations from which it had too long suffered. Free access to the Heathen was now hardly at all hindered in any serious way, and it was particularly in its spread amongst the Heathen generally that the true religion had now to seek and find its most assured existence.

But, further, inasmuch as Christ had some forty years previously appeared in the Community of this nation, and as he had shown most clearly for those and all times what was the nature of the true and perfect religion, the first and great question of the age was what would be the attitude of the members of this nation to him and to his requirements. The answer to that question, however, had been most plainly given in a twofold form before the unquenchable conflagration of the last world-conflict had broken out—first, by all that took place at Christ's crucifixion, and, secondly, by all that followed in the course of the next three decades. Even before the great war it had become as clear as possible that only a small fragment of the ancient nation would seize the true Consummation that was involved in the thorough logical development of the inmost intentions and aims of the true religion, whilst the far larger and more powerful portion of the widely spread Community, and the portion most proud of the special sanctity and philosophy of a nation of Israel, held persistently aloof from the Consummation. Moreover, these two irreconcilable antitheses had, down to the commencement of the great war of annihilation, grown more and more marked and stubborn, though they might not be outwardly separated. Of those who believed in Christ, many had already, in spite of innumerable trials and sufferings of the most serious kind, learnt to hold fast to their faith; on the other hand, the rest of the nation had, in their resistance to this new faith, already collected more and more immovably and exclusively around the caricature of the ancient

true religion, which Judas, the Gaulonite, had most distinctly set up. But that caricature, exaggerated by the innumerable controversies of that particular age, necessarily brought its adherents into conflict with the most powerful Heathen empire, because it supposed, overlooking, as too weak and too vague, the true Consummation and Glorification of its Divine archetype, that it was able to take up the conflict with that empire for the rule of the world. Instead, however, of conquering Rome, it was crushed by it; and by the utmost force to which earthly elements can be subjected, that decisive crisis had thus suddenly arrived which, in consequence of the increasing complication of all the circumstances, would necessarily have come sooner or later.

It was really a magnificent spectacle that was presented by this war, such as was without a parallel in human history. What a history this national Community had had! In the early period of its foundation it was only with difficulty that it conquered a national soil in which it could develop unhindered, in conformity with its own most characteristic mission. In the fairest period of the second great phase of its history it received marvellous strength through the harmonious co-operation of the Basiliocracy with the Theocracy, and really for the time reached the threshold of a great universal empire. But in the long course of the centuries it so far declined from that position that it was compelled severely to suffer and to fight for its existence in the world; and appeared to have attained to new and most unexpected prosperity when, during the glorious middle portion of its third transformation, and in the midst of the full energy of the Hagiocracy, it had once more wrested its ancient country from the Greek supremacy, and obtained fresh respect amongst all nations. At last, in the period before us, partly as by inevitable higher destiny, and partly of its own temerity, it had been drawn into a contest with the most powerful nation of the ancient world for the rulership of the world, the issue of which would necessarily be of momentous importance for all future time. The momentous events and crises of a thousand years had thus been gathered up and interwoven in this war in such a way that the same nation which had once been completely destroyed, by rejuvenating itself, and lifting its head more and more proudly, could now venture seriously to aspire to universal empire, and to enter upon the most trying struggle for it; and by the magic power of a long-tried true religion, what had never hitherto taken place in the history of the world, in this case occurred—an

ancient nation, which was already practically annihilated, was able thus to renew its youth and contend in this way for supremacy. The prophecies and anticipations of the supremacy of the true religion in the world, which had from early times always been heard in this nation, enkindled this contest and accompanied it; and if the Hagiocracy of the revived people of Israel had in this case been victorious at the eastern limit of the Roman empire, Eastern Asia would soon have felt its arm, and Jerusalem would really have been as triumphant as the representatives of the Hagiocracy had long desired. However, the retrograde movement into which the history of Israel had increasingly fallen during its third great period necessarily found its completion in its two characteristic respects. As the Hagiocracy had more and more sought deliverance by a mere return to everything that was regarded, according to the sacred Scriptures, as sacred in the early period of the nation's history, it was only logical that it should, with growing confidence, insist on those wars against the Heathen, the primary models of which the sacred books kept before this late generation, even though the Heathendom of the time was the entire Roman empire. And whilst the Hagiocracy thus, completing with utmost final effort this retrograde movement, commenced this life-and-death struggle, as if the Roman empire were only one of the ancient nations in the neighbourhood of Israel of whom the Scriptures spoke, e.g. Edom or Moab, it necessarily, with the whole of the nation that still adhered to it, rushed upon its ruin, that it might pay the just penalty for the worst error that it could commit. For such a recurrence to the past might not be successful in a nation which was supplied from the first with the basis and the motive of a much loftier Consummation, and in a nation to which this Consummation itself had actually already come, the latter itself likewise reverting more strictly to that first commencement as the perfectly true one, but only in order to show by contrast more distinctly and satisfactorily its own nature.

Thus the great crisis had arrived. It is true the full severity of it was borne in the first instance by the main body of the ancient Community alone—the Judeans, and whoever else had been carried away by them to take part in the revolt; but the young Christian Church had taken its rise from its first planting too exclusively from that Community, and had continued, down to the time before us, interwoven with it in too various ways to permit it to remain untouched by the terrible catastrophe of the time. Neither of the two Communities, though

they were then separating farther and farther from each other, was able to emerge, in the endeavour each made once more to gather together its members and make a new start, from the vortex of that overwhelming and destructive torrent without undergoing the profoundest changes: the catastrophe had been so amazing, its arrival so surprising, the revolution which it produced so permanent.

Over the grave of the second great destruction of Jerusalem and Israel, moreover, there reigned for a considerable time the stillness of death, as if no true life could ever again be found there. The stream of history, which had just rushed onward so wildly, was suddenly as it were dried up, and in subsequent reminiscences of it scarcely anything more than a barren vacuity marks this spot. Even the history of the young Christian Church, although the latter could not be directly affected so powerfully by the catastrophe, was for a considerable time, as it were, under an eclipse at this point, without continuity or light.

Nevertheless, in this changed Community of ancient Israel an immortal life had from the hoar past been developed in too many ways and too indestructibly to permit this death, even though it were the second since those early times, to prove at once an eternal one for all. Not only those portions of the ancient national body which had, before the terrible catastrophe, obtained through Christianity Divine immortality, and which had, on that account, already made themselves more independent of it, and were able most easily to adapt themselves to the altered circumstances, but the non-Christian portions also possessed, after all, too much invincible and inexhaustible life to allow that catastrophe to at once exterminate every sign of vitality in them. Moreover, the catastrophe had come, at all events upon the non-Christian masses of the nation, too unexpectedly and suddenly to prevent those members of the people at all capable of a new life from attempting it, and putting forth all their remaining energies after the first terrible insensibility produced by the calamity was over. The conclusion hitherto reached was too detached even for this ancient Community that was stiffening in its hoary errors, and thus, it is true, on the way to the immovability of death. The transition was too abrupt, and the mere power of the stunning blow itself too great.

Those times when the authorities and limitations hitherto in force had suddenly been removed, opened, therefore, in the first instance, a free course for innumerable experiments; and in

both Communities we see the most various and most unusual undertakings commenced, though in each in very dissimilar ways. The new Community may now feel itself entirely freed from all connection with the ancient one, and in that respect for the first time independent; and, already, it finds itself spread abroad in the wide world in the face of Heathenism. Consequently, all its young energies display themselves the more freely and enterprisingly, but also often with less restraint and at great risks; and in the face of many straits from without, the restlessness of young growth and development is soon so general and so intense that it must become a life-and-death inquiry with it to determine how it shall get the better, with its young tender life, of these internal commotions. In the ancient Community, too, as soon as ever somewhat more of fresh life can again stir within it, the most various experiments have to be made, involving the utmost exertion of all its energies. But, in its case, the essential thing is to recover what has been lost; and, owing to its old and established constitution, such experiments may the more readily prove immediately successful. However, even the perception of the fact that the real choice ultimately lay only between the old and the Christian Community was at that time by no means incontestably established, especially as the new Community itself had not attained in any way such a stage of development that no other choice could well be thought of. Accordingly, in this last period of the history of Israel, we meet with a number of hybrid developments which, more or less, try entirely new courses, and borrow from Christianity, without the intention of following it purely and sincerely. And, thus, there soon arises the commotion and conflict of utterly various endeavours throughout this whole region, at first somewhat hidden from the eyes of the world at large, and then with increasing publicity. It is the young genuine Christian Community itself which is thereby most retarded and endangered; it is the young tender germ and the opening bud of true Christianity that is most exposed to quick ruin under that strife and ferment of opposing experiments, which had, nevertheless, to come into collision once more, in some way, on the soil of the ancient true religion.

But if, amid all this commotion and ferment of the most irreconcilable endeavours, the ancient Community now once more lifts up its head, as if from the stupefaction of its second death, and if it seeks once more to renew its former life, it must thereby be only the more distinctly shown whether the great decisive crisis of which we have spoken in its two aspects

was really as necessary, influential, and finally inevitable, as was in fact the case; that is, whether the immortal elements which could arise as the eternal fruit of all Israel's history, labours, and struggles, had actually found an imperishable place in the world in spite of all storms and convulsions, and whether the perishable, false, and wrong elements that had arisen in the nation, and had at last assumed a fixed and powerful shape and sought to perpetuate their existence, had really been already thus absolutely condemned before the Eternal Judge or not. This constitutes the real significance of this closing section of the history of Israel; and it is only at this point that the history finds its no less necessary than its absolute close for all time. Whatever had been too abruptly introduced was thereby brought into complete symmetry and harmony by fresh movements and changes; the mortal and the immortal elements, although they had previously been thrown into a process involving their final separation, had then, by a new series of concluding operations, following upon the most violent convulsion of the whole nation, to be finally separated in order that the latter might remain established in the world in their eternal form, while the former would wholly perish. We may, therefore, most appropriately describe this period as that of the *final issues* of the whole history. And while we now, on the one hand, descry the bright issue into that life of lasting salvation which was destined, as arising at this place in the earth, to become the eternal possession of the race, we behold, no less clearly, on the other hand, the issue into final ruin which was necessarily developed and consummated in that wrong life, and must in our own time be likewise developed in every similar life. Or, if we attend solely to the eternal elements brought out at the close of this history in all directions, we may witness at this point the first pure fruits as they become the salvation of that age, and as they are also gathered in more permanent vessels to be preserved not merely for those times and those that immediately followed, but for the entire future of the race. And if we desired to look more exclusively at the Christian aspects of this age, we might also call it the *Post-Apostolic age*, since most of the Apostles and the most active of them had already met their end, whilst the spirit of the Apostolic age was still making its effects most deeply felt. Still, the latter name, if used alone, would be inadequate, inasmuch as the Christian element was now separating more and more completely from its counterpart.

It is a period of some seventy years which is occupied with

this transformation, just as a similar period of stupefaction and desolation, but also of revived consciousness, succeeded the first destruction of Jerusalem. The third, as the last great epoch of the history of Israel, is thus prefaced and concluded by a dreary pause of considerable length, as if the peculiar spirit of this nation were seeking at these two boundaries to collect all its energies, to seize and retain the perfect elements by its side which had at last to appear as the genuine fruit of this long history. But the perfection which in the earlier seventy years was only just prophetically forecasting for the future its own outlines, and was only seeking its own difficult commencement, was in the seventy years before us already in existence in a luminous form, and, having already become a stable nucleus, is just freeing itself completely from the dark integument in which it still lay.

The Stages of the Development of this Final Period.

If Christianity, as that issue of this history which leads to lasting salvation, almost necessarily, and so irrevocably and completely, separates itself, even at the commencement of this closing period, from the ancient Community, that we may plainly see in the latter the issue leading to final ruin, it might seem the proper course in tracing the details of the history to follow the fortunes of each of the two Communities separately through the period of seventy years which brings everything to a conclusion. However, that complete separation, with its unavoidable necessity, is itself first accomplished during these seventy years; the fortunes and the position of the one Community continue powerfully to affect those of the other, and the older Community is all along unable to familiarise itself with the idea of the younger one, that has proceeded from it, being equally entitled with itself to claim independence and power. Nothing could be more difficult than that the one of these Communities should completely separate from the other, that the new one should, as far as its noblest and most powerful elements were concerned, at all events, rise as a completely independent structure upon its own new rock, and that the old one should abandon all thought of being able to subject to itself again the new one which it supposed had revolted from itself. As, therefore, the new Community had then nothing else to do than to seek the calm development of its young strength, but the old one, if possible, the reconquest of all its former power and glory, the commotion and noise of the history of

this period continue to proceed far more from the old one, which has been smitten down, than from the patient and enduring new one. The larger section of the narrative must, therefore, be determined by this fact; since the great question is really only how a Community, apparently so completely broken up and dashed to the ground, could, nevertheless, gradually once more rise with great energy and provoke another final decisive struggle, a struggle which in its issue powerfully reacts upon the new Community also. On the other hand, however, alongside this loud and agitated development, there is going on a far quieter and more spiritual one, and one of far more decisive moment for all following time, within each of the two Communities which are separating more and more fully; and it is this latter development that we must most carefully attend to, particularly as regards the eternal fruits in both cases.

But few heroes of eminent originality, it is true, come prominently forward during this period of seventy years in either Community. The Apostle John's noble form meets us again in this period as well as in the last, which was the true Apostolic age; yet John cannot be compared with Paul; and large as must have been the number of other distinguished leaders amongst the Christians of this period, none of them towers in height above the aged Apostle of immortal youth. On the diametrically opposite side of the Judeans, notwithstanding all the spasmodic efforts that were made there, not a single truly great hero was possible, for the reason that absolute and simple straightforwardness was then lacking. It is of the very nature of such transition periods as this that the new elements that have already arisen in them with creative power, and are approaching their maturity, should reach their perfection with difficulty, while the antiquated elements only gradually decay, so that quite new, creative, extremely energetic, and great men are hardly necessary in the first case and are impossible in the second. Prominent and marked climaxes are met with in the movements of these years on both sides, but the movements themselves are in neither case purely creative and original, and accordingly lack sublimity. We do not therefore call this age after an individual or a few great men which rise like giants above all the rest; the period of the mere *issues* of this history of two thousand years did not require such heroes, what formerly only a few were and did being in this age the possibility and the duty of countless numbers. All the more, therefore, depends in this period on the attitude and the condition of the multitudes of each Community.

The Sources of the History of this Period.

The above-mentioned want of great and original movements in this age has had an effect on the state of its historical sources. For it is here that we meet for the first time with the want of great men around whose history the richest series of narratives and other historical sources are abundantly deposited. The sources of this final section of Israel's history, when the history of Christianity begins at once to branch off more and more independently from its original stock, are incomparably more scattered and evidently more scanty, and moreover much less pure, than is the case with regard to any of the former sections, although the contrary might be expected just when this entire national history is first becoming more influentially connected with the history of the world. Indeed, it might seem as if the sources of history were about to be wholly dried up at this point, just as the history of the ancient nation appears to lose itself now in the sands, that it may give place to wholly new existences which are henceforth to occupy the territory of history.

Amongst the subsequent generation of the ancient Community there was really not even a Josephus left to describe connectedly in an historical work the course of this period of seventy years of the history of his own co-religionists in any such way as Josephus, soon after the conclusion of the first great Roman war, had described the last decades and centuries previous to his time. The last wars between the Romans and the Judeans really ended far more destructively and hopelessly, and particularly produced far greater exasperation and alienation than the first; so that amongst those who remained from those wars there was no one who had the desire and heart clearly to review the course of the seventy years before us, and to delineate it for the whole educated world. The complete extinction of Israel as one of the nations of the earth shows itself at the end of this history in this also, that there was no one left belonging to it possessing the desire or the ability to narrate as an eye-witness its last catastrophes before all the world, and to appeal thereby to a better posterity.

On the other hand, though the Christian Church was during these seventy years all along leading a life of sufficient activity and change within its own sphere, it did not supply the conditions likely to call forth anyone to relate early enough, and with sufficient painstaking and completeness, its history during

the same period: it was too much occupied with its own concerns to regard the great world, had all along its mind directed too exclusively to its celestial Lord, was too little acquainted with the ambitions and the warlike noise of the world, was for the most part too seriously hampered by the suspicion and the hatred of Jew and Gentile, and was, moreover, too dispersed and too deficient in outward unity and temporal stability in any form to produce such a work. The mere fact that at this time it lacked the weak bond of a real outward unity such as kept it together during the Apostolic age, and that it was united far less than the Judean communities by any compulsory form of outward connection, was very unfavourable to the rise of any general history of this period: the history of the Church was lost in that of thousands of distinct churches, those which were locally nearer together even having but little close connection. The work of Hegesippus, referred to in the previous volume,[1] supplies us with some brief but extremely important information regarding our period, such as might be expected from a man who, writing about the middle of the second half of the second century, was well acquainted, from his own personal inquiries, with the condition of the Church not only in his native country, Palestine,[2] but also in many other parts, even as distant as Rome.[3]

We unfortunately do not now know the plan of his work, which was divided into five books. But it was so far from reaching a purely historical plan and execution that Eusebius was able to boast in the introduction to his own history that his was the first to do that. Valuable, for this period, however, as the extracts from earlier writings are with which Eusebius for the most part puts together his work,[4] neither in his case do we get a connected narrative and truly historical account.

[1] Vol. vii. p. 35.

[2] He was, as Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 22, 8, inferred from his work, of Judean descent, regarded the parent church in Jerusalem and the East as still existing after the destruction of Jerusalem, and travelled to Rome by way of Corinth.

[3] As he himself says in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 11. 7; 22. 1–3. In the first edition of this work, vols. vii. and viii., I have shown, by making the proper use of his information, how erroneous it is, when the school of Baur maintain that Hegesippus was an Ebionite and his work therefore unreliable. To judge from the quotation of a few sentences from his work which Photius has preserved, *Bibl.* cod. 232, 13, following Stephanus Gobarus, it is true he seems to condemn, in opposition to 1 Cor. ii. 9, those who supposed that the perfect Revelation had not yet appeared in a visible form, and, indeed, seems to expressly condemn those words which Paul had adopted from a Sacred Scripture, as if he wished to appear as an opponent of that Apostle. But in fact, according to the real connection of his remarks, he is only opposing those who thought, supported by that passage, that the perfect Revelation had not appeared in Christ; this follows from the fact that he appeals in refutation to Christ's own words, Matt. xiii. 16, and other passages of the Scriptures of a similar force.

[4] It would, however, be in the highest degree unjust if we were to suppose that

The works mentioned in the preceding volume,[1] which were very much read in the most various forms, and were often regarded as an introduction to the Bible, and which are now generally known as the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*,[2] are of great use for the information they contain as to ecclesiastical institutions, which were kept up essentially in the forms that they had received especially in the period before us. But as the composition of these works began somewhat subsequent to our period, and then passed through various forms, we must use them for our purpose only with great caution. With regard to their literary form we shall speak below.

Such being the condition of the historical sources of this entire period of seventy years, it has in recent times often appeared to be almost a desolate and barren period, with regard to which little or nothing could be said with certainty. A very recent school, claiming to be philosophic and historical, has used this appearance to throw into confusion all conceptions and truths regarding the Apostolic and post-Apostolic age, and to maintain a multitude of new and hurtful errors. Others have in our day formed at all events very baseless and in part confusing notions with a view to the explanation of this apparent historical desert; particularly the idea that the entire generation of Christians which followed the Apostolic age had suddenly become far weaker and more degenerate, and thus was wholly forsaken of that vigorous spirit which had inspired the Apostles.

But in reality we still possess a number of the most vivid and expressive testimonies from the midst of these years, coming, in fact, in some cases from the noblest and most powerful contemporaries themselves, which serve excellently in helping us to form the most correct ideas regarding the period. The only thing is to know how to find them, and to make proper and reliable use of them; and we may regard it as the good fortune of quite recent times that not a few of them have just been brought to light, after they had long lain in obscurity and had been completely misunderstood.[3] If we

all the statements and narratives in connection with which Eusebius gives no authorities, were invented by him, or are to be regarded as merely legendary. We must in each case examine the details.

[1] Vol. vii. p. 36.

[2] Comp. on the Syriac *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Leipzig, 1854, the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1855, pp. 128 sq.; much of a similar nature is found in the *Reliquiæ juris ecclesiastici antiquissimæ, Syriace et Græce*, ed. P. de Lagarde, Leipz. 1856; see *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1851, pp. 1021 sq. The last and best Greek edition of the work is that of P. A. de Lagarde, Leipz. 1862. [Had the *MS.* of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (published by Bryennios, Constantinople, 1883) been known in 1868, the author would have referred to it at this place.]

[3] We shall mention them in detail below.

make proper use of the sources which are the first and the most copious, and connect with them the numerous other widely scattered accounts and historical traces, this apparently obscure period comes once more clearly enough into view, and an important connecting link in all our historical knowledge is restored again to its proper place.[1] Undoubtedly the drops of historical information and reminiscence do not in this instance combine so as to make a strong continuous stream, as they do in so many of the earlier sections of the history of the nation; both Judeanism and Christianity then lacked a great central place of material power and unity, and in the case of the first the living stream of historical life loses itself irrevocably in dust and sand, whilst in the case of Christianity a firm commencement of outward and rigorous unity and of visible supremacy in the world is only just about to be made. Nevertheless, this period is all the richer in the clear knowledge of the eternal fruits of the entire history; and we can still obtain that knowledge with the greatest certainty.

[1] I have spoken upon this subject at some length in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1856, pp. 650 sq.

I.

THE FIRST ATTEMPTS ON THE PART OF THE JUDEANS TO RECOVER THEMSELVES.

The Time of the Flavian Emperors.

1. *The New Position with regard to the Romans.*

The outlook must have been terribly depressing when the scattered and defeated remnants of the ancient and venerable nation tried seriously to think of recovering once more power and respect in the world on the basis of their ancient religion and the culture and position they had hitherto possessed, or even of once more gradually recovering all their former power and rule in the Holy Land. For, in addition to the immense destruction and humiliation to which the nation had been subjected, the profound sorrow of most, and the bitter despair of many, of its noblest members, its entire position in relation both to the Romans and the Heathen generally, as well as to the Christians, had been suddenly changed completely at one blow, and the whole nation had been as it were hurled down into a primeval condition of non-existence, from the dark depths of which it had first to rise again by its utmost efforts, being thus compelled to begin all higher endeavour *de novo*.

It is true Judeanism might have flourished afresh beyond the limits of the Roman empire of the time. A great number of the fugitives had undoubtedly then turned to the unconquered Arabian countries.[1] The Jews whom we meet subsequently settled in large numbers in North Arabia, in Yemen, and in Ethiopia, and elsewhere in those parts, may have been first dispersed thither at the time before us. But as far as the period immediately following is concerned, they are quite lost to history. We can easily understand, from the situation described in the preceding volume,[2] why the Parthian Judeans did not venture to make a second rising during these decades; a real improvement in their situation had certainly not taken place. In the Tauric peninsula and in other northern countries dependent only to a small degree, or not at all, on the Roman empire, flourishing Judean communities existed

[1] See vol. vii. p. 613.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 518 sq.

previous to the last great war,[1] and their number was now undoubtedly greatly increased by fugitives;[2] but they were far from desiring to interfere in the internal affairs of the Roman empire. In that empire itself, as matters had shaped themselves during the preceding centuries, most of the Judeans had long become so thoroughly settled that the communities scattered through it were not likely to be made very restless even by the calamities in Palestine; and the future fortunes of the Judeans remained thus mainly bound up with those of the vast Roman empire.

In those wide countries of the Roman empire the Judeans had to suffer as never before the scorn of the Heathen world, and that the more as just before the pride had been great with which a true Judean of that period, both in the Holy Land and beyond it, had looked down upon the Heathen. The national privileges and advantages in public matters which Israel had obtained from the time of Julius Cæsar and Augustus, and, indeed, from the time of the earlier Persian and Greek kings, had also, strictly speaking, been wholly forfeited by the issue of the great war; and they might all be the more easily revoked, as the Flavian dynasty had obtained its first imperial consecration especially through the finally successful humiliation of the defiant nation, the rule of that house seeming, therefore, to be inseparably connected with that humiliation, and its glorious continuance to depend on the perpetuation of it. As a new dynasty, moreover, it was the less under obligation to continue the favour which the Augustan family had formerly granted. If, nevertheless, single exceptions from this withdrawal of all previous privileges and liberties were permitted, that did not by any means arise from any consideration for the great predominant section of the ancient nation which had just been so completely conquered, but from other reasons. When Titus, in opposition to the efforts of the Heathen, restored to the Judean community at Antioch its former privileges,[3] he gave, it is true,

[1] The inscription (the mention of which was anticipated, vol. v. p. 239) at Panticapæum (*Corp. Inscr. Gr.* p. 1005, comp. 1008) states that a widow, Chreste, manumits a domestic slave, named Heracles, with the consent of her heirs and the Judean synagogue (we must read probably πρ. θωπείας τε καὶ προσεταιρήσεως), belongs to the year 81 A.D., comes from a country not directly under Rome, and is evidence of the prosperity and tranquillity of the Community. Comp. Wertheimer's *Jahrbuch*, 1860-61 (Wien), pp. 174, 177, and Heidenheim's *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Engl. Theol. Forsch. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 353.

[2] The other earliest evidence regarding these communities is supplied by Hebrew inscriptions on tombs, on which comp. the essay by Chwolson, *Krimische Grabinschriften*, Petersburg, 1865, and the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1866, pp. 1241 sq. [On these Crimean Hebrew inscriptions see now the more recent accounts referred to in Schürer's *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu* (1886), p. 499.]

[3] Vol. vii. p. 611.

a precedent to which every other community outside Palestine might appeal. Moreover, many of these communities could, with more or less reason, plead in excuse that they had not altogether participated in the great rebellion. Then, again, many individual communities as well as persons had either from the first, or at an early period during the course of the war, faithfully adhered to the Romans; it was only just that they should not be involved in the punishment, or even that they should be rewarded for their good services, as far as could be. It must have soon become apparent, too, that the sale of all the landed property of the Judeans in Palestine, which Vespasian had commanded,[1] could not be successfully carried out, as Judeans could only with difficulty be persuaded, and the Heathen probably for the most part showed little desire, to purchase ruined and insecure estates. The Romans seem accordingly to have soon contented themselves with leaving many of the former Judean possessors undisturbed, if they promised entire subjection. Still, all these were only exceptions; and even to set foot on the soil of Jerusalem was undoubtedly made either difficult to the outlawed or repugnant to them; as we can hardly suppose that the Roman garrison placed there would permit them to move freely on that soil and collect again around the ancient site of the Temple.[2]

We have in the case of Flavius Josephus an example of the way in which the Romans exerted themselves to reward the few who were quite subservient to them. This man, who owed his liberty to Vespasian and considered it an honour to be able to embark for Rome with Titus in his triumphal march, received from him other lands in the country near Jerusalem instead of his patrimonial estates, which appeared to be too insecure on account of the Roman camp to be erected there, and was afterwards always munificently remembered in Rome. Vespasian gave him apartments in a house that had previously been his own residence, assigned to him an annual pension, conferred on him the privilege of Roman citizenship, and gave him (as his enemies probably laid waste his former estate near Jerusalem) another large property in Judea. The man lived so securely and comfortably in Rome that he divorced the wife whom Vespasian had given to him as a share of the spoil,[3] and who had borne him three sons, and took to himself another wife, a rich Judean of noble birth from Crete. Domitian, too, with

[1] Vol. vii. p. 612.

[2] With regard to the intention of rebuilding the Temple, which is indicated *Epist. of Barn.* xvi., see below.

[3] Vol. vii. p. 547.

the Empress Domitia, remained until his fall graciously disposed towards him, conferred upon him even higher honours, and relieved him of all taxes on his large estate in Judea. This man, though of high-priestly descent, persuaded himself that by such profound subserviency he could best promote not only his own but also his nation's interests; probably flattered himself too that when it should please his imperial patrons to restore more or less the Temple of Jerusalem, he would then become High-Priest in it;[1] and thus spent his days in Rome in learned leisure, seeking literary fame also, and outliving the Flavian dynasty. However, we are sufficiently informed that his efforts and his ambition of this kind were all along terribly thwarted by the greatest hostility in every form on the part of his fellow-countrymen, so that without the patronage and most active sympathy of each of the three Flavian emperors he would hardly have been able to spend a day in comfort.[2]

Probably many Judeans collected at this time around King Agrippa, who was still living; and though his father, at all events during the last years of his life, had been smiled upon by the most favourable fortune that a Herod could hope for,[3] he might now have considered himself happy that he had saved so much as his little kingdom on the south-eastern Lebanon from the great commotions of the last years. It is doubtful whether he continued in the period of tranquillity that followed to make himself a name, after the traditional habit of his family, by the erection of new and costly buildings in his country.[4] He lived after peace had been restored, on the contrary, as far as we can judge from the information at our command, like the other principal members of the Herod family, for the most part in Rome itself, under the immediate eyes of the emperors, honoured by Vespasian with the dignity of prætor, and gratified with the addition of some territory;[5] and although he did not renounce

[1] We are justified in inferring this from the earnestness with which the vain man urges in his book *Contra Apionem*, i. 7, that everyone of high-priestly descent, if he desires to marry a woman of an equal rank, must before the marriage have the purity of her stock, and that she has not been a slave, judicially authenticated in the high-priest's court at Jerusalem. He had himself, when he took his last wife, evidently submitted to this legal form, and we can understand with what motive.

[2] See especially *Vita*, § 76, and the remarks to be made thereon below.—The statue which is said to have been erected to him in Rome, Euseb. *Eec. Hist.* iii. 9, must have been put up at the command of Domitian most likely; and probably he himself does not mention it, because he knew it was in violation of Judean customs.

[3] Vol. vii. pp. 257 sq.

[4] Vogue and Waddington have quite recently discovered in the Hauran the ruins of a temple erected in honour of Agrippa and Herod: comp. *Revue de l'Instruct. publ.* 1862, Sept., p. 376, and *Revue Archéol.* 1863, Mars, pp. 204 sq. The year does not appear to have been found, but we may suppose, from vol. vii. p. 259, that Agrippa I. and his brother Herod, king of Chalcis, are intended.

[5] As we may infer from Jos. *Vita*, § 65, compared with *Contra Ap.* i. 9, *Ant.* xx. 7. 1, and Cassius Dio lxvi. 15;

Judeanism, but endeavoured to stand on friendly terms with such men as Josephus, for instance, still he desired at any cost to maintain, if possible, even more than previously, peace with Rome as the chief aim of his reign. He lived till the year 101 A.D. as far as we can gather from the coins that have come down to us and other indications.[1] Many undoubtedly for a time placed greater hope in his sister Berenice than in him, but unhappily for no worthy reason. As most of the Herods, of both sexes, lived always most licentiously as regards matrimonial relations, as if neither a Baptist nor a Christ had appeared, the Queen, Berenice, likewise had previous to the outbreak of the great rebellion paid little heed in this respect to the judgment of the world; having become early in life the widow of her uncle, Herod of Chalcis,[2] whose small kingdom was then conferred by Claudius on her as a king's daughter,[3] she had then lived long with her brother in such relations that, on account of the scandal this created in the world, he married her to Polemon, King of Cilicia; but she soon forsook this husband, who had wedded her merely for her money.[4] During the great rebellion she put herself forward on every occasion, even in the Roman camp.[5] Notwithstanding her years, she was able to captivate Titus, as soon as he appeared in Asia as the hopeful son of Vespasian, to such a degree that he took her afterwards as conqueror with him to Rome, appointed her a residence in the Palatium, and remained constant to her during Vespasian's reign; indeed, it was said that he promised her marriage. In such circumstances many Judeans may have conceived fresh hope for their nationality from this connection. But no sooner had Titus ascended the throne on the death of his father than he followed better impulses, and sent her, against her will, away from Rome.[6] But with the death of Agrippa the end of

the addition of territory is mentioned by Justus only, in Phot. *Bibl.* Cod. 33.

[1] It is said most definitely in Phot. *Bibl.* Cod. 33, that 'he lived until the third year of Trajan;' with this accords what we may gather from the writings of Josephus (see below); the coins of his which have thus far been discovered do not come down so far.

[2] Vol. vii. p. 260.

[3] We may probably most correctly conceive the relation referred to vol. vii. p. 421, as follows: the two daughters of Agrippa I., Berenice and Mariamme, were to have, as *queens*, the revenues of Chalcis and to be equal in rank to their brother, Chalcis bordering on his territories; Berenice, as Herod's widow, had a special claim to that position.

[4] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 9. 1; xx. 7. 3.

[5] See vol. vii. pp. 497–502, and Tac. *Hist.* ii. 81, where she is said to have been *florens ætate formaque*; yet we can hardly suppose a younger Berenice is intended; she was still quite young when she was left a widow and without children, and in the year 70 A.D. only a little more than thirty; and according to Tacitus she made an impression on Vespasian also.

[6] Tac. *Hist.* ii. 2; Suet. *Titus*, cap. vii.; it does not follow distinctly from Cassius Dio lxvi. 15 that she was sent out of Rome during Vespasian's reign. We see from Juven. *Sat.* vi. 156–160, how indignant the Romans were at this connection.

all the glory of the Herodean dynasty had come. The emperors did not confer the small kingdom upon any heir, and we know nothing of any of the descendants of this proud royal line. None of them is mentioned in connection with the subsequent wars. We cannot suppose that they had then all died out, as we hear of the end of one of the younger members of the house,[1] who, together with his wife, met with his death in the outbreak of Vesuvius in 79 A.D.; they disappeared amongst the crowd of ordinary mortals.

Thus during this period so many Judeans led a merely decaying existence, having resigned all higher ideas, both rich and poor being content to be able to live from day to day. Of the large number of necessitous members of the nation who led a vagrant life amongst the Heathen, and particularly in Rome, many devoted themselves more and more to the most degraded arts in order to live, and from being the teachers of the Heathen, as they formerly claimed to be, they now often became mere magicians and soothsayers, such arts still being, in Rome especially, eagerly looked for from the East.[2] It was then usually the ancient sacred name of God—Jahveh—which had at length become only a mysterious and magical sound that was used for such incantations and spells in various ways by the magicians.[3] Such was the outcome of the esoteric teaching and scholastic philosophy of this period! The Roman poets also, who had previously been inclined to satirise the peculiar race,[4] came now to pour upon them increasingly severe ridicule.[5]

[1] Agrippa, son of the Drusilla mentioned vol. vii. p. 421; Jos. *Ant.* xx. 7. 2.

[2] A fact specially referred to by Juvenal in relation to Jews and Jewesses, *Sat.* vi. 542–547, he classing them, only as more timid people in this respect, with the Egyptian, Syrian, and Armenian (or Cappadocian) magicians, as if they had taken to their bad course really not so shamelessly as the latter, but only as from necessity.

[3] Comp. Jos. *Ant.* viii. 2. 5. Martial's *jura per Anchialum*, epigr. xi. 94. 8, is probably only a transformation by Martial, by way of satire, of the Hebrew אנכי אלהים *anokhi elohîm*, Ex. xx. 2. The evil consequences of this superstition extend far and wide through subsequent times, and even Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxx. 2, remarks on the *magices factio a Mose etiam nunc et Lotapea* (probably corrupted from *Jocapea*, the mother of Moses, see vol. ii. p. 157) *pendens*. The first Christian writer that draws inferences from the ineffable character of the name Jahveh is Xystus, Lagarde's *Anal. Syr.* pp. 12, 4 sq.; 23, 21.

[4] With Horace, *Sat.* i. 4. 142 sq.; 5. 100 (Judæus *Apella*, i.e. *libertinus*, as most of those then in Rome were), 9. 69 sq. (where *tricesima sabbata* undoubtedly means the Sabbath, or festival, which falls on the thirtieth day of the month, i.e. the new moon; just as *feria prima* &c. was subsequently used), Persius, *Sat.* v. 179–184, is in complete accord; the latter describes the Sabbath as *Herodis dies*, evidently because in his time one or another of the Herod family often kept the Sabbath in Rome with all the Judean solemnities, when so many other fellow-worshippers or spectators would flock together.

[5] Juvenal, *Sat.* iii. 13–16, 296; vi. 156–160, 542–547; xiv. 96–107; on this description see further below in connection with Clement. Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 544 sq. calls the Jewess also the *high-priestess of the tree*, but not with any reference to the tree of life in Paradise, the fruits of which

The new Mutual Relations of Christians and Judeans.

For the moment of less public importance, but for the future of incomparably greater significance, was the new relation into which Judeans and Christians were now being brought towards each other.

During the increasing rage of the wild storm of the last war scarcely any traces of the existence of a Christian Church were to be seen. It had for the moment given forth no sound; for some time after the end of the storms we seem to feel as if it had disappeared from the noisy scene of history; and really the necessity of accommodating itself to the sudden and completely changed position of things had been laid upon it. It is easy to understand that the parent Church, and likewise the other churches dispersed in all directions, even if they retired from the struggle between the Judeans and Romans and kept themselves perfectly quiet,[1] would have much to suffer from the commotions of the period, both during and after the war. To the exasperated Judeans their tranquillity and retirement was obnoxious,[2] whilst the Romans continued to often confound them with the Judeans,[3] and treated them probably after the war as they did the latter. But in reality the issue of the great war necessarily proved beneficial in the highest degree to the Christian Church, in the same proportion as it proved ruinous to the ancient Community. And once more one of those great moments of history had arrived in which relations that had long become too involved and intolerable had to be suddenly ended by one Divine and mighty blow, so that from the midst of the greatest ruin the Divinest good might arise, contrary to all human expectations.

For with one great and irrevocable blow the Christian Church was now separated from the Judean, to which it had hitherto always been attached, as a young vigorous shoot to the root of its ancient parent tree, or as a daughter to her mother. It is true the distance which divided the two had become continually greater during the course of the Apostolic age, but even

she promised to bring to her customers, but, as we see from iii. 13–16, for the very ordinary reason that the Judeans of Rome had at that time rented the ancient grove of Ægeria, as if the poet would ridicule them as having nothing more than a rented tree around which to collect and edify themselves. The ridicule of Martial, *Epigr.* vii. 30, 35, 55; xi. 94; xii. 57, 13, is much more bitter, but less important and clever.

[1] The action of the parent Church in this respect, vol. vii. p. 526, might serve as a model to all the other churches.

[2] As one of the Sibylline books of this period shows, see my *Abhandlung über die Sibyllenbücher* (Göttingen, 1858), p. 62.

[3] Even in Arrian's *Diatrib. Epict.* ii. 9, we still meet with this confusion.

Paul had not wished at the climax of his labours wholly to cut away the bridge which connected the two communities, although for him that bridge consisted simply in the existence of the parent church at the foot of the Temple, and in his own readiness to die as a sacrifice for Israel's salvation. A thing which Paul had not ventured to do, which Christ himself had not, humanly speaking, the power to do, and which he had not desired to do, as then untimely, had now been accomplished by this one Divine blow. This immense change in all the relations of Judeans and Christians, as well as its immediate consequence, would at once appear to the simplest mind that meditated on what had happened; and the more prominent Christians were able, as they further reflected upon the change, to correctly perceive the more profound significance which it involved.

Everything characteristically Judean had now received in the eyes of the world also a blow from which it could hardly, or indeed never, recover. The lofty pride of the Judean, which had been increasing down to the beginning and even to the very midst of the war, had been most terribly humbled, and anyone who lived at this period, though but a simple-minded Christian, or anyone who was not a complete stranger to or opponent of Christianity, must have henceforth seen the mutual relations of the two communities in a much clearer light. We possess remarkable evidence on this point in the epistle of *Mara, son of Serapion*, addressed to his son Serapion,[1] which at once translates us into the midst of a small war that arose out of the great Judean struggle. In the latter the Roman vassal, Antiochus, the King of Comagene, with his capital Samosata on the Euphrates, and a portion of Cilicia, had contributed and repeatedly renewed a respectable auxiliary force, in the last instance under his son Epiphanes.[2] Antiochus was always regarded as loyal to the Romans, and indeed stood towards Vespasian in the relation of a sharer of his camp and a friend. But he was connected with the Herod family by ties of marriage, and his son had on that account even become a Judean.[3] That

[1] It has only recently been discovered and published in Cureton's *Spicil. Syr.* pp. 43–48, and I immediately established in detail the true nature and the origin of this important document, in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1856, pp. 661–664.

[2] See vol. vii. p. 597 and the passages there referred to. According to the language of Josephus we might almost conjecture that the reigning king of this small fragment of the earlier empire of the Seleucidæ was always called Antiochus, and his hereditary successor Epiphanes.

[3] We may conjecture this as at all events highly probable from Jos. *Ant.* xix. 9. 1, according to which passage Agrippa I. on his death-bed betrothed his second daughter Drusilla, then in her sixth year, to Epiphanes, who was then undoubtedly still quite young. As a fact, Josephus would have hardly traced generally with such particularity the life of this Antiochus, who was at the time of

fact might suffice to attract to his court a number of Judeans, and as the latter easily fell under the suspicion of being conspirators with the Parthians against the Romans,[1] a rumour perhaps on that account got abroad that Antiochus was about to revolt from the Romans. Vespasian, to whom this rumour was reported by the governor of Syria, Cæsennius Pætus, and who was always on the look-out for suitable pretexts for seizing vassal countries, thereupon, 73 A.D., commissioned the governor to depose Antiochus. Pætus accordingly advanced with a Roman legion and the auxiliary forces of the allied kings Aristobulus of Chalcis and Sohemus of Emesa unexpectedly against Samosata. Antiochus, who was conscious of his innocence, left with his whole court the city, and determined not to make any resistance with his army, which was encamped near the city. Even when his two sons had nevertheless begun to use force, he preferred to retire unarmed to Tarsus in Cilicia, where the Romans made him prisoner. His sons, on the other hand, indignant at the treachery of the Romans in whose ranks they had so bravely fought a short time before, fled with a few faithful attendants to Seleucia, to the Parthian king Vologeses; and not until they heard subsequently that Vespasian had assigned their father an honourable exile in Lacedæmon did they surrender.[2] Now amongst the most trusted friends of the king the above-named Christian Mara was found. It seems that he had specially to suffer the displeasure of the Emperor, and whilst he was still kept a prisoner he wrote, in view of all this sudden change of fortune, and meditating on the true relation of men to God generally, words of deep-felt exhortation to his son, who was separated from him for he knew not how long. His exhortation bears the appearance rather of having come from one of the nobler Greek philosophers, and its thoughts are conveyed scarcely at all in New Testament phraseology; yet it is inspired completely with the sublimity and Divine peace of a true Christian, and belongs to the best productions remaining to us from antiquity. As at that time, therefore, the great war between Judea and Rome had hardly been finished, the brief judgment regarding it of an honest simple Christian of that period meets us in this epistle,

Vespasian an old man, unless his family had been in some way closely connected with Judeanism.

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 517 sq.

[2] This account follows Jos. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 7. 1–3; comp. with v. 11. 3, where Josephus beforehand significantly points to this great change of the prosperity of this family that subsequently followed. From other sources we simply learn that Comagene was seized by Vespasian (Suet. *Vesp.* § 8). Nor need it surprise us that Josephus presents Vespasian's conduct in this matter in a milder light than that indicated by Mara, when we consider the relation of Josephus to the Emperor.

incidentally, in a very direct and fresh form. Mara ranks Christ with Socrates and Pythagoras, and simply supposes that the Judeans, then deprived of their country and dispersed throughout the world, had been so far from gaining anything by the crucifixion of 'their wise king,' that from the time of that murder their kingdom had gradually declined, and was then completely exterminated, while the king whom they had slain was living for ever in his new laws.[1] It is true this judgment is thrown into an entirely different form to that which it would have taken some hundred years later, but with all its simplicity and antique character it only expresses the more truly the great fundamental fact which it is intended to deal with, and we must regard it as specially noteworthy that it is the oldest utterance, outside the New Testament, now known to us regarding Christ. We may very well suppose that this Mara had forsaken Heathenism in every form, and attached himself to one of the Christian churches, although he declined to be a teacher in it. And as this honest man thought regarding Christ and faith in him, so might any educated Heathen think if he had sufficient seriousness and carefully considered the events of the age.

The great and disastrous error to which the ancient Community had resigned itself with ever diminishing resistance during the third great phase of its history had, indeed, been now most terribly punished—namely, the error of seeking the Divine only in a sacred book and written laws, or in the doctrines and sacred usages derived from them; with which error a vain confidence in the ancient sacred place, or in innumerable other futile things, was naturally involved. But what was now above all punished was the great final sin of the Community which was connected with that error—its grievous misunderstanding and rejection of Christ, who showed to it the one true means of salvation, by which it might once more have delivered itself from that error, and its persecution of his disciples also, who sought after his crucifixion to continue his work of admonishing it of its sins. The innumerable endeavours to which the main portion of the ancient Community devoted itself and the calamities which befell it subsequent to the bright midday of this third phase of the national history, were in the most various ways connected, more or less closely, with the same fundamental error which Christ opposed in

[1] In Cureton ܡܘ, lines 15–20, where at the beginning some such word as ܒܙܩܝܦܘܬܗ must have dropped out before ܡܠܟܗܘܢ.

the only true manner. Many things had at last brought to a climax the difficulties of the Community, which nothing but the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans could resolve. These were the false tendencies of the Biblical scholars and philosophers, including those of a Philo; the constantly growing prevalence of a passion for the rapid acquirement of wealth; the exasperation, obduracy, and stubbornness connected with the contentions and wars with the Heathen; and, above all, a blind and deadly hatred of the truth, which had at last presented itself before it from its own midst, and as the offspring of its own truest life, and in a form the most gentle and amiable, and of that truth which, when it had been by force, and then, after the first dark deed of violence, continually denied, necessarily only accelerated the overthrow upon the downward course already taken. But as the crucifixion of Christ, of all the innumerable misdeeds connected with the fundamental error, had been, by its meaning and tendency, the most grievous, it was likewise the most memorable, and that which shone forth most glaringly in the light of the world. One simple and sufficient reason for this was that the band of the disciples of the one true leader, who had been really found on this cross, necessarily obtained their first rallying point in that crime, and now they had long been so firmly formed into a Church of the Cross, that Christ's memory could never again perish by any catastrophe, but, on the contrary, every great and unexpected new event could only serve to give it ever higher lustre, because every such event could only afresh recall his word and his truth.

At that time, however, the issue of the great war necessarily reminded his disciples most forcibly of his word and his appearing generally. For not only had the inmost force of the Hagiocracy, which had nailed him to the cross, been finally destroyed, but the anticipations and prophecies which he had given utterance to with reference to the entire situation of the ancient nation of the true religion had been fulfilled within a comparatively brief period and with most surprising truthfulness. Christ had incontestably anticipated and clearly foretold the approaching overthrow of the entire commonwealth of that people of Israel which then existed under the pretence and pretext of being the true Theocracy, and also the destruction of Jerusalem;[1] though the immediate

[1] We perceive this so clearly because these predictions have been so well preserved in the oldest sources of Gospel narrative (see *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, pp. 407 sq.), and also because the very life-breath of the Apostolic age (as we

connection of the prophecies was a further question, as the truth of a particular prediction does not necessarily depend on other anticipations which may get attached to it. That first great event of the future had now happened in the terrible form in which Christ had expected, and thus for the first time the other presupposition resting on Christ's word[1] had evinced its truthfulness in the souls of all Christians—namely, the truth that all the words of Christ would outlast even the utmost changes and revolutions. As the Disciples had for thirty or forty years always looked with the most intense expectation for the fulfilment of all his predictions, and as the parent Church had fled from Jerusalem in the year 66, because it was convinced that the prophecies which Christ had left to the Disciples with reference to such an *end of things* had then been accomplished,[2] so they undoubtedly perceived with agitated astonishment that a great part of the predictions of the Lord was now fulfilled with the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, and could the more believingly await the fulfilment of the rest. We have in the Gospel of Luke, which was written in the first years after the destruction of Jerusalem, plain evidence of the earnestness with which the fulfilment was then compared in the Church with the prophecy, and we learn also that particular expressions of the latter acquired, in the process of comparison, a somewhat altered form.[3]

Whilst Christians looked thus with increased confidence to the fulfilment of such an important part of the prophecies of the Lord, they also found themselves generally delivered with less loss and placed in greater security than others from the great calamities of the day, and might for the first time be grateful for a deliverance which they had experienced in consequence of their being Christians. While they had been kept as by a celestial warning from taking part in the war with Rome, they were also spared its permanent painful consequences. It is true they were undoubtedly often classed by the Romans with the Judeans, and were also probably sometimes claimed by the latter as their people; but their great difference from the Judeans became daily more apparent; and probably the

have seen, vol. vii.) presupposes them; Paul, too, alludes to them in his epistles (see *Sendschreiben des Paulus*, pp. 48 sq.)

[1] We refer to the two closely connected utterances Matt. xxiv. 34, 35.

[2] For 'the word of Christ,' which was heard at that time in the parent church (see vol. vii. p. 526), was undoubtedly based on such expressions as Matt. xxiv. 15–18; new prophets arose to prophesy that the flight of which Christ had spoken was necessary, as τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως was already in Jerusalem; for the events that took place in 66–67 in Jerusalem could be thus interpreted.

[3] See *Jahrbb. d. Bibl. Wiss.* iii. pp. 142 sq. [*Die drei ersten Evang.* (2nd ed.) pp. 100 sq.]

Roman demand of a new poll-tax, which every Judean was called upon to pay to the Capitol,[1] first caused the Romans to make in law a distinction between them and the Judeans. To have demanded the tax equally from Christians would have been the greatest injustice, though it may often have been committed in the case of Jewish Christians.[2] Moreover, they could now much more easily escape the claims which the Judeans had previously raised with regard to them, and the oppressions of all kinds to which they had subjected them, since the most essential part of their previous connection with the Judeans had been abolished by the destruction of the Temple, the arrogance and power of the Judeans had been so greatly humiliated, and the Roman magistracies could not so often be induced to decide against the Christians in their favour.[3]

It is easy to perceive what new and great advantages were involved in all this for early Christianity, and what great disadvantages for the ancient Community. After the issue of the great war no Christian would be likely to desire to return to the ancient Community; and not a few members of the latter, especially such as were moved by a tender conscience, or who had previously had but little intimate connection with the Temple, felt themselves more powerfully attracted to the new Community—points which will come before us again. Nevertheless, Christianity had hitherto by no means been so strong and so unchangeably organised as a society that the weaker souls of the ancient Church could easily go over to it; and other motives still might easily arise to give a new impulse to the ancient Community.

2. *The new Judean Schools.*

For the ancient Community still continued to feel itself too exclusively opposed to the Romans, that is, the Heathen; and the excess of grief brought with it a stubborn spirit of gloom, while the humiliation inflicted by ancient enemies only embittered the saddened heart still more. Of all those who had until the last withstood the Romans, there was, on account of their subsequent severity and cruelty, undoubtedly none their friend; and many of those who had earlier in the struggle

[1] See vol. vii. p. 612.

[2] As Domitian compelled by the most shameful means even those *qui improfessi Judaicam fidem simulem* (the probable reading instead of *intra urbem*) *viverent vitam*, i.e. Jewish Christians, to pay the tax, as Suetonius, *Dom.* cap. xii., relates from the experience of his youth.

[3] That Vespasian especially was more considerate towards the Christians is an early Christian reminiscence which Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 17, comp. v. 5. 7, probably did not derive simply from the brief statement in Tertull. *Apol.* cap. v.

separated themselves from the partial or complete Zealots, or had even surrendered to the Romans, must have been bitterly provoked by their cruel action. But neither the Zealots who had most stubbornly fought against the Romans, nor the lukewarm and frivolous, were any the more inclined to attend to Christianity; in the case of the former the ancient sacred Law was too much revered, in the case of the latter it was too convenient and traditional, to be exchanged for Christianity, especially as the latter was still undeveloped and despised; and both classes might still regard Christianity as simply a degenerate schism in their midst. If we add all the motives of resistance to the Roman system above referred to,[1] and consider further that it was not easy for any Judean, as Judeanism then was, to fall wholly into Heathenism, it is not remarkable that the large majority of the Judeans of that time remained true to their religion, notwithstanding the terrible disasters which had befallen it and their nationality, and that as soon as they were able they once more firmly reunited around its sacred institutions. It was really Zealotism only which had been put down and laid in the dust by the Roman hosts; from this time it lies for years in the tomb, and hardly anyone thinks of rousing it again. But if the question was whether Heathenism was to have the sole sway with the complete destruction of Judeanism, the answer of the time must be the less doubtful, as the Romans never seriously thought of violating the latter if it would only humbly acknowledge their political supremacy.

Accordingly Judeanism soon asserts itself again against that supremacy; at first in humiliation, gently, and cautiously, as having been seriously warned by the utmost calamity. And there were not wanting at any time manifestations of profound mourning, self-accusation, and confessions of sin.[2] But no genuine amendment was to be expected from this Judeanism; this could come to it simply from Christianity, its despised and misunderstood offshoot; and all that it had hitherto seen of triumphant Heathenism was least fitted to remove its ancient prepossessions and overcome its obstinacy. Therefore all the errors and perversities which had grown old with it, now once more revived, if at first timidly restrained and greatly moderated, yet always in danger of acquiring full power at any

[1] *Ante*, pp. 6 sq.

[2] The days of mourning which were from that time appointed, or rather revived from the first destruction of Jerusalem (see vol. vii. p. 606), are well known; there was added further, either at this time or after the rebellion under Hadrian, fasting every Monday and Thursday: see Jos. *Hypomnest.* cap. 154, ed. Fabr.

favourable moment, and of afresh gaining the ascendency over everything else.

In consequence of the complete subversion of national union and power, as they had hitherto been represented in the Sanctuary and the learned schools of Jerusalem, the separate communities which still existed in Palestine might apparently have been continued unchanged, as the Roman rule was of itself not hostile towards them, while the Parthian and other non-Roman countries might rather show a kindly sympathy with the bitter fortunes of the nation. But the developed Judeanism of this period was so closely connected with the great Sanctuary at Jerusalem, or rather with the Hagiocracy attached to it, that the destruction of that centre necessarily most seriously affected its continuance. All the separate and widely scattered communities had looked for centuries to it for instructions with regard to the observance of the injunctions of religion, the solution of their doubts, and answers to their inquiries, and even the fixing of the annual solemnisation of the Passover;[1] even the Parthian and other non-Roman communities were unable to withdraw from this connection; and, during the last centuries particularly, this stricter union of the scattered communities had been more and more perfectly developed, and formed the mainstay of the power of Judeanism. If all this had really been that which the Judeans in their blindness deemed it—the perfect true religion—it would not have needed such stays; but as Judeanism then was and wished to be, it could not think of doing without them, as, indeed, no earthly Hagiocracy can dispense with them. That Hagiocracy was founded mainly on the hallowing of a book of law, on the interpretation—supposed to be correct—of all its precepts, and on an observance of them—which was painfully forced—as has been previously explained.[2] The more essential, therefore, the multitude and the most exact observance of particular laws thus became, the less could a judicial court for constant supervision be dispensed with; the separate communities, and indeed every Judean, had necessarily become accustomed to look for the action and the judicial decision of the central authority in the capital of the Hagiocracy; the habit and the desire in the case

[1] Comp. *Antiquities*, p. 348. In the period immediately preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, watchmen were placed, at the approach of the new moons, upon the summits of the hills to watch for the signs made from the Temple hill announcing the beginning of a new month, that they might spread the announcement by similar signs through the country. This custom was similarly though undoubtedly less rigorously kept previous to the destruction of the first Temple, according to Jer. xxxi. 6.

[2] Vol. v. *passim*.

of the representatives of this rule had become strong to unite more closely all the Judeans scattered over the earth by the aid of such a centre, and in that way to rule over them.

As soon, therefore, as the first shock was over, and it was possible to look round, all the instructed minds which looked on Judeanism as the highest true religion, necessarily began to think of restoring even the outward framework of the Hagiocracy, as far as the new age would for the moment permit. All those who combined with the various acquirements and capacities needful for the work the rare courage required, found before them an interminable field of new labour. If it was determined, on the one hand, not to permit Judeanism to be overwhelmed and corrupted by Heathen and Roman elements, and, on the other, to defend both the individual communities and single souls against the new influences of Christianity, and, at all events, to preserve their religion in its essential features for a better time, the active and courageous spirits still remaining found work enough to their hands. But what an entirely different form this outward framework of the Hagiocracy must take from that it had ever borne before!

No sober Judean of that time could hope for a speedy restoration of the magnificent sanctuary in Jerusalem, as the true centre of his religion. If in the case of a few (as we shall see) the hope was for a time entertained that the Romans would rebuild it under certain conditions, and at the same time convert Jerusalem into a strong fortification against their own Parthian and other enemies, it would only be such Judeans as a Josephus, who were dishonoured amongst their own people, who could think of accepting such conditions. Without the Temple, the sacrifices, which during almost a thousand years could legally be offered only in it, had become impossible. In so far, therefore, the high-priest could be dispensed with; and it was fortunate that it then happened that this high office, which the Romans would never have suffered to continue in any important degree of independence, had become so uncertain as regards its holders, and so degraded in point of influence, that no one seriously felt its absence, and after its last occupier had fallen no one possessed any definite hereditary claim to it. Amidst the calamities of the time, it was a specially happy circumstance that, with the destruction of the Temple, the last claim of the Herods to a certain degree of supervision and rule of the nation ceased; and certainly no true Judean now desired the slightest revival of their dominion. The Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, which had also become involved in the rebellion against Rome, had

now been dispersed, and could not reckon upon any acknowledgment on the part of the Romans, even supposing that without a high-priest it could have laid claim to any legal position. Still less could there be then any thought of a prophetic power.

There remained, therefore, though in an entirely different form from that succeeding the destruction of the first Temple, nothing else, as the impulse, stay, and beginning of a new rule, than that which is the most inalienable and permanent when it has once come into existence—learning and science represented in the school as the voluntary association of teachers and disciples. In consequence of the mental development of Israel during the previous six centuries, this school could only be that of Biblical scholars and experts in the Law; and they were now the more imperatively called upon to do their duty as they had for so many centuries been conscious of possessing the vocation to be the sole guides of the nation, and no other power had originated and sustained more than theirs the last great revolt. It had now to be shown, more than ever before, what the school when thrown upon its inmost resources could accomplish; and its character was revealed in a new form of consecration for its true teachers (Rabbis, Doctors). As so many ancient ceremonies had perished with the Temple, it is not surprising that the consecration of the Rabbis, as the only spiritual leaders then possible, was invested with fresh solemnity. Every new Rabbi had to be dedicated by the most solemn *imposition of hands*,[1] by an acknowledged master with the assistance of other teachers, and only when that ceremony had been performed did he rank as an accredited teacher. However, ancient as a dedication of this kind was in Israel, the example of the early Christian Church, as in another important instance (see below), evidently shows here its influence.[2]

Now, it is true that learning and the school have often proved in the darkest and most hopeless periods of a nation's history one of the most powerful levers for its elevation and reinvigoration; and they seemed at this period likely to do this service for the completely dispersed remnant of the Judean national Community. It is, in fact, marvellous to see what a new spirit of life seemed once more by their means about to re-enter the lifeless and scattered members of the ancient people, and how the dead bones began to stir as if the vision of Ezekiel might once more be realised as six centuries before. Zeal for reno-

[1] Called then סְמִיכָה.

[2] See vol. vii. pp. 135 sq.

vating, with all its influence, the once flourishing university of the fallen Jerusalem in some suitable locality soon became ardent; notwithstanding the calamities of the time, bold scholars, animated with the idea of the imperishable nature of their religion, commenced courses of lectures, and numbers of eager pupils gathered around them; soon a new form of teaching and of learning, such as the changed times required, was originated; and amid the labours of these seventy years, which soon became so enthusiastic, the foundation of the Mishna and the Talmud was laid. The distinguished doctors of these seventy years were subsequently called *the elder Tânâîm*, as their work was then continued to the close of the Mishna by more recent teachers. This Aramaic name *Tânâi*, in conjunction with the Hebrew word *Mishna*, is in itself a very modest appellation for such a teacher, signifying simply one who *repeats* or afresh relates and applies older doctrine and wisdom;[1] it is the learning taught in the University of Jerusalem in the period preceding the destruction of the Temple which is here presupposed as a sure basis to start from; and the immediate object of the Rabbinic school is to perpetuate and propagate it by living teachers. But in such a greatly altered period, of course, a vast multitude of new questions arose which had to be dealt with between teachers and disciples. Further, a teacher of this kind, like those who arose in the schools of the Christian Middle Ages, claimed the right to deal with questions proposed to him by communities or individuals, to make reports upon them, and thereby to exercise a kind of judicial authority.

From the Talmud and related writings we learn the names and very many of the doctrines and sayings of the most distinguished and subsequently most revered of these teachers. Their names and sayings were so well preserved because they became the true founders of the Talmud, or rather of the new tendency of thought which finally found its most complete literary development and permanent record in that collection of writings. Anything like a distinct idea, however, can be formed of those few teachers only from whom a number of sayings of most different kinds have been preserved; still, we

[1] A teacher of this kind was therefore simply a *Repetent*, as the Germans say; and as the name *studiosus* may still be used of the teacher, so the verb תָּנָא = שָׁנָה is used of both teaching and learning in the Rabbinic school. We have a literal translation of Judean *sentences* of this kind in δευτερώσεις, Epiphan. *Hær.* xiii. 1; xv. 2. The name Rabbi is older (see vol. vi. p. 232). More general names which these teachers themselves use are חֲכָמִים *wise men*, סוֹפְרִים *Biblical scholars* (γραμματεῖς).

have also scattered information of various kinds regarding the manner of life and characteristics of these men.

One of the first teachers, who was most esteemed by all succeeding writers, was *Jochanan, son of Zakkái*,[1] and one of the few who was afterwards elevated by the name *Rabbân* above the ordinary Rabbis. At the destruction of Jerusalem he was already advanced in years, and is said to have escaped to Titus from the besieged city, hidden in a coffin, with several other moderate men of repute.[2] From that time he was regarded as friendly to the Romans, and it was long afterwards related how severely and wittily he exposed in allusive stories the folly of the resistance to the Romans carried on by those who had at last got the upper hand in Jerusalem.[3] He did not, however, become a Flavius Josephus, although he was always reckoned amongst the moderate men.[4] But he used the favour of the Romans so as to get permission to set up a public school. Numbers of pupils flocked to him, and by his zeal no less than by his gentleness and skill in teaching and deciding questions, he obtained very general esteem. His motto was, 'If thou learnest much Law, do not keep anything good (of it) for thyself; for for this (to learn and impart much) thou wast created!'[5] But the place where he opened his school is itself significant; he selected for this purpose Jamnia (Jabne), near the sea, west of Jerusalem, that is, the same town which for seventy years past had been closely connected with the Roman rule and was always regarded as favourable to it,[6] the population of which was not even principally Judean, while it had early withdrawn from any participation in the great rebellion. After his death the saying arose, that with him the *splendour of wisdom* declined:[7] he displayed this wisdom in no small degree in the choice of a locality so acceptable to the Romans. Other teachers selected other places where they could gather pupils about them, for instance Lydda,[8] a little to the north-west of Jerusalem, and not far from Jamnia; but in Jerusalem

[1] In the Greek form Ζακχαῖος.

[2] See vol. vii. p. 600.

[3] We may derive from him not only the story about Qamssa ben Qamssa, *B.* Gittin, fol. 56 *b*, but also, on account of the same spirit, that in the אבות דרבי נתן, ch. 4; as regards the meaning of both I have spoken at length *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1868, pp. 902–7; comp. also Her. viii. 128; Heliodorus, *Æthiop.* ix. 5; Abulfatch, *Ann. Sam.* p. 114. 17.

[4] Hence he was called a disciple of Hillel also and not of Shammai only (see vol. vi. p. 34), *Pirqæ Abôth*, ii. 8.

[5] *Pirqæ Abôth*, ii. 8.

[6] See vol. vii. pp. 244 sq., 553.

[7] See the account, of general historical importance, of the death of so many successive illustrious men, *M.* Sotâh, ix. 15. As to the school at Jabne and Jochanan himself, see *M.* Edujôth, ii. 4, Sanhedrin, xi. 4, Roshshana, iv. 1 sq., *G.* Berakoth, fol. 17 *a*, and the איכה רבתי to i. 5, fol. xlvi. 4.

[8] See *M.* Jadaim, iv. 3.

itself no one opened a school, evidently for the reasons above mentioned.[1]

But greatly as all who were actively engaged in some kind of restoration of the Hagiocracy and its unity were limited by the circumstances of the time to the almost inalienable right of teaching, gradually an institution was zealously sought after which should be more fitted than the simple school to bring back again a more vigorous unity into Judean affairs. Every Judean community had, as we have seen,[2] its body of Elders, to whom the supervision of it belonged; and this institution was everywhere still in existence. Could not a similar one be set up for all Judeans throughout the world? This idea soon occupied many minds, and it was carried out in a certain form. The Sanhedrin with its seventy-two members had, until the fall of Jerusalem, been legally the highest court of Judeans generally, and all the authority of the Hagiocracy had been possessed by it; if it could be restored, it might again serve as an instrument of a closer union of all Judeans. It is true the utmost zeal could not do more than effect an apparent restoration of that court, but the semblance was tried. If a generally respected and wealthy man was found who apparently opened a school simply, but really gathered about him, in addition to his younger pupils, some seventy-two men somewhat more advanced in knowledge and learning, this might represent the ancient sacred Sanhedrin, as far as the troubled times permitted; and whatever such a number of seventy or seventy-two men agreed upon would appear to possess a sacred binding authority for all the dispersed individuals and communities of Israel. The head of a school of this kind was really found in the *younger Gamaliel*, the grandson[3] of the elder Gamaliel[4] and the son of Simon,[5] whose reputation stood so high in the last great rebellion. He occupied his position of teacher surrounded by seventy men, who considered themselves authorised to pronounce a decisive opinion with regard to every question that concerned the religious and national community of Judaism;[6] and this office, voluntarily recognised by his people, he retained for a considerable period. He traced his descent[7] from Hillel, whose judgments were distinguished for their lenity and moderation, and by Hillel, on the mother's side, from David; and on that

[1] *Ante*, p. 17.
[2] Vol. v. pp. 86 sq., 242.
[3] See concerning his descent *M.* סוטה, v. 15.
[4] See vol. vii. pp. 193 sq.
[5] See vol. vii. p. 539.
[6] As appears from the plain instances *M.* Judaim, iii. 5; iv. 2.
[7] See vol. vii. pp. 193 sq.; vol. vi. pp. 19 sq.

account Gamaliel was held in great respect by Judeans far and wide at a time when the renown of ancient families was doubly dear; and it was therefore the more natural that many should give him, as the president of his council, and in a certain sense the head of the Judeanism of the time, the name *Nasi*, i.e. Prince, by which he was held in memory in following generations. By his side and as his representative, a distinguished jurist, with the title of *Father of the Court of Justice*,[1] conducted the business of the Council—an arrangement which was continued by his successors. But if this court, which existed only clandestinely as it were, without the knowledge and sanction of the Romans, was not to formulate its resolutions without effect, it was felt that something must be added in support of them; and this was the right of *excommunication*, which now received new power. Every community had long used a form of excommunication as a protection against its own unworthy or rebellious members;[2] it was now felt that such an instrument was needful for the whole national Community, in order that a member who compromised the credit and resisted the authority of the highest court might be excluded from the entire Judean body. Thus in these troubled times, when there was a general desire for a new separation from the world supplied by a strict national unity, excommunication was invested with a power never known before;[3] and the more a community is threatened from without, the more rigorous disciplinary powers will it seek for its own members.

By such means and the labours of such men more life and union was undoubtedly brought into the profoundly afflicted and widely scattered remnant of the ancient Community of Israel. But it is not needful here to quote all the doctrines and sayings of these teachers which were remembered by later generations, or to repeat the various detached recollections of their learned and other life as subsequently written down; for very many of them have but little bearing upon the general history which we are concerned with; and all of them form but the beginning of a long subsequent development. It was simply because these teachers, as men who succeeded in maintaining Judeanism against all its opponents in this new age, became illustrious models for their Rabbinical successors, and simply because the Judean life without a Temple and under

[1] Comp. his name in the *New Hebrew*, vol. v. p. 430.

[2] See vol. vi. pp. 292 sq.

[3] Wiesner's book, *Ueber den Jüdischen Bann* (Leipzig, 1863), gives a summary of the passages bearing on the subject, but is in other respects not very satisfactory.

Heathen rule became, as founded by these teachers, the basis of all the development of the subsequent centuries, that everything which was known of them in any way at the time when the Mishna and Gemara were written down had such an importance for their successors, as the continuators and finishers of their work, that even things most unimportant of themselves appeared deserving of record. Of the earlier teachers, including those previously mentioned[1] and their successors, only those few and far more disconnected things which were still known of them as important for that age were received into these collections. The Muslim proceeded in much the same way with their 'Sunna,' or 'Hadith,' recording therein at an early period whatever Mohammed and his colleagues were supposed to have said and done at some time; in both the Talmud and the Sunna the same object also is kept in view of preserving in such reminiscences and records the best sources for decisions in doctrinal controversies and legal questions. Purely historical accounts of the lives and labours of even the most prominent of these men were never subsequently written: it was only as the heads of schools and beginners of a new legalistic Judean life without a Temple that they were of importance to posterity; and to this must be added the fact that these later times lost more and more, as we have seen,[2] the historical sense.

The Talmudists.

If we inquire more strictly what was the real aim of these teachers in this new age, and by what means they sought to realise it, it is impossible not to perceive its general perversity and futility. It is worth while to show this more in detail.

It is the same Biblical scholasticism of the Pharisaic cast essentially unreformed, as we have seen it gradually rising and developing,[3] which now, after a brief interruption, seeks to rehabilitate itself and begins to rule more rigorously than ever the ancient Community wherever it was still to be found. So persistently had this direction of the national mind been developed during six centuries, that we now see it immediately recovering itself after the terrible calamities of these years and beginning afresh the whole of its difficult task. This is, therefore, a new illustration of the exceedingly great difficulty with which this tendency of the national mind could be overcome or abandoned. It is true, Christianity had been overcoming it during the past forty years, thereby accomplishing the most

[1] Vol. v. pp. 275. [2] *Ante*, p. 11. [3] Vols. v–vii.

difficult task which a new religion can attempt in its infancy; but at every stage of the greater success of Christianity in the world, this powerful tendency in the ancient Community opposed it most mercilessly, and, indeed, ascribed all the calamities and storms of these last decades to the spread of the Christian schism.[1] The separation had been practically for ever decided before the last great war; but since the Christians had at the beginning of the war wholly withdrawn from the ancient Community and its Temple, the animosity of the dominant Pharisaic party must have been increased; and it is quite intelligible, therefore, that of the party which had crucified Christ, stoned Stephen, and left James the Just to perish, there should be only a very few who, amid the smoking ruins of Jerusalem, could be moved to take a worthier view of Christianity. On the contrary, if previously the complaint was sometimes made that the Law had not been sufficiently observed, and if a sacred law is always capable of a still more rigorous application, and yet can never bring true strength and elevation, so now the cry became louder than ever that the insufficient observance of the Law, and its desecration by the heretics (Christians), was the great reason of the general miseries of the time. The consequences of such a cry are obvious.

Thus far the continued dominance of this tendency was a consequence of the past history of the nation. But now a new powerful inducement to return to the past arose out of the immediate present, if there was a desire to secure a complete victory for the tendency and a more perfect development of it than ever. As the Temple, and with it the entire hierarchical and sacrificial system, had been hopelessly destroyed, there remained, as a visible sacred thing, for a tendency which exalted the Law beyond everything else, simply that Law itself with the accom-

[1] As we saw vol. vii.; and hence, according to a saying of the elder Eliezer, *M.* Sota, ix. 15, it appears to be a sign of the coming judgment that *the kingdom* (the Theocracy of the Law) *will then be transformed into* מִינוּת *schism* (heresy), meaning thereby Christianity. Comp. the distinction, *M.* Megilla, iv. 8, 9, between מינות and חיצונים, i.e. probably the Sadducees. It is a futile subterfuge of later Jewish scholars to suppose that by the *Minim* not Christians generally but only Jewish Christians are meant. It is true the word easily bears a more general signification, but we do not meet with it before Christian times, and it then always signifies primarily Christians. By its very frequent use the short form מִין at last comes to mean simply a *heretic* (e.g. in Steinschneider's *Catal. Cdd. Lugd.* p. 395), just as יִשְׂרָאֵל without the article means an Israelite, גּוֹי a Heathen, and עַם הָאָרֶץ a common man. Originally the sing. was מִינִי or מִינִי (see *Heb. Gram.* § 164 a.c.), as the Aramaic form הַהוּא מִינָאָה *iste hæreticus* (abbreviated to מִינָא, *B. Aboda zara*, fol. 4*b*) shows. As a derivation of it from מִין *species* (lit. *form*, something *visible*) is hardly permissible, we shall be probably compelled to recur to the root מָן in the meaning discussed in the *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* xi. 10 sq., as the Hebrew מְאֵן, *rebellious*, is also ultimately connected with it. In some books, מאין also is the orthography.

panying sacred books. At all events this sacred object could not be destroyed by the Heathen: if at times they attempted its destruction,[1] knowing well what it was in the eyes of the nation, a thousand ways were found at last of more firmly keeping and more heroically defending it. In fact, for similar reasons reverence for the Law and the hallowing of it had been greatly on the increase in the interval since the destruction of the first Temple:[2] this tendency and desire to make sacred books the one firm basis of all religion, and even of all theology, were simply now completed and extended. The entire Law was now to be observed more strictly and scrupulously than ever before, if possible; and all the sacred books met now with a reverence of a special character such as far exceeded the extravagance in this respect of the preceding centuries. It was as if Israel had all its spiritual life in these books alone; and if something of the same kind had not subsequently occurred in the case of the Koran amongst the Mohammedans, the example which it supplied in this respect would have been without a parallel in history. These books, however, had long required a skill in their interpretation and application which every man was not master of, and this was now the more requisite as in the altered times a thousand new decisions had to be given on their basis. On this account the Biblical scholars once more resumed outside Jerusalem the work which they had for centuries carried on within its walls, and they prosecuted it with a zeal, diligence, and patience, and also with a prudence, which must have provoked an unmixed admiration had so much skill and capacity been employed in a purer cause. The unlearned members of the Community could only desire in these times that able *Masters* (Doctors, Rabbis) might voluntarily arise who would teach how men ought then to live in order to remain members of the Community of Israel, and who would particularly understand how to resolve the much graver doubts that now arose on this point so much more frequently than before.[3] The Biblical scholars

[1] E.g. when they would not publicly tolerate the sacred Scriptures, but devoted them by law to destruction, as Antiochus Epiphanes (vol. v. pp. 298 sq.) and Vespasian and Titus (vii. p. 612) seriously proposed, and as several Heathen before them considered necessary (vii. p. 417). But it was not until the end of this period that Hadrian took up in full earnest such measures as aimed at the entire annihilation of the Judean religion: see below.

[2] See vol. v. *passim*.

[3] This is described most vividly in the Fourth Book of Ezra, particularly xii. 44 sq.; xiv. 20 sq.; likewise 2 Baruch xxxii–xxxiv. xlvi.; comp. xlviii. lxx. To the same period belongs the saying, '*Procure thee a Master* (רַב) *and get rid of doubt!*' which is ascribed to the elder Gamaliel in *Pirqæ Abôth*, i. 16, but which may be referred for good reasons to the younger Rabbi of this name, as may the saying soon to be mentioned.

became now really the sole teachers and guides of the rest of the people, inasmuch as the hereditary priests of high and low rank, for the time at all events, found practically nothing to do after the destruction of the Temple, and had to be content if they could continue to exist as Biblical scholars or otherwise. Not a few of them really distinguished themselves as Biblical scholars: this way of being useful was, however, not only open, as always, to every other capable man, but it was now more than ever inviting; and if previously, as we have seen,[1] all social distinctions were lost in the presence of learning and its special difficulties, still more in these troubled times might the poorest artisans often become the greatest scholars. In these circumstances arose what may be briefly called the *Rabbinic age*.

During the previous centuries, it is true, very different tendencies had prevailed at various periods amongst the Biblical scholars, and a multitude of powerful influences had come down from them to these new times. But the party of the Zealots, which had last of all carried everything before it, had been so completely struck down, at all events for a long time, by the calamities of the last years that even their views and the names of their principal representatives remain unmentioned in these schools. There was left, therefore, from former times the party of the Pharisees, who now seemed, as having been formerly most powerful and also tolerated by the Romans, at all events less dangerous than that of the Zealots. It is true the Pharisees precisely as regards their most important functions—their desire to rule the kingdom by participating in its public affairs—were also now practically annihilated; it was only their learned traditions and principles which had survived the national overthrow. The Sadducees, with their greater pride and freedom of mind, have, on the other hand, now so entirely disappeared that the only trace of them is the frequent mention, by way of illustration, of the refutation of their principles and opinions by Jochanan ben Zakkái in his old age.[2] It is therefore undeniable that the views, doctrines, and customs of the Pharisees became those of the Rabbis, only in a more intensely scrupulous form. The earlier renowned teachers amongst the Pharisees, however, had by no means all held the same learned principles and doctrines, inasmuch as the sect formed rather a political than a purely learned school; and as

[1] Vol. vi. p. 189.

[2] According to the long account *M. Jadáim* iv. 7 sq. The piety of the Pharisees, פְּרִישׁוּת (lit. *separateness*), is still greatly commended in this period, e.g. *Pirqæ Abôth*, iii. 13, *Sota* ix. 9, 15, twice.

in the period before us a stricter or freer tendency was early developed on occasion of the necessity of pronouncing decisions on so many questions of the time, these Rabbis liked to appeal to a similar difference of tendency which had existed in the earlier Pharisaic school between Hillel and Shammai.[1] Hillel, the grandfather of the elder Gamaliel, was looked back upon by these later teachers as the great teacher of the Law, distinguished for the mildness of his disposition, the wealth of his wisdom, and also for the concessions he made to reason; while Shammai was remembered, on the contrary, as the excessively rigorous and zealous master, who settled everything according to ancient tradition; and different principles were mentioned which each had followed in interpreting and applying the Scriptures, whilst the greatest respect was entertained for both men. Accordingly the Rabbis liked to be considered as disciples of one or the other of these two highly honoured masters, who had lived nearly a century before their time, and the memory of both was now revived with new splendour.

In this way these Biblical scholars reviewed the entire range of legal obligation as they found it made law by their sacred Scriptures and the ancient customs of the Judeans. They brought within its sphere not only all the duties of individuals, but also all the institutions of the Community; and again, not merely those duties and institutions which were practicable, and perhaps fitting for the straitened present, but also all those which had previously been observed in the life of the nation in its greater independence, or which were practicable according to their Scriptures. Their thought proceeded on the supposition that they were still living under the former kingdom of Israel, as if that alone were lawful, and as if everything belonging to it that had been destroyed could and must be at once restored. Thus they sketched the complete plan of the Temple as it was and as it ought to be,[2] as if it must be at once rebuilt according to it, if the resources of the Judeans once more permitted.[3] But there is no mention of a true monarchy, or of the conduct due to a foreign government.[4] The Hagiocracy, as it had been developed

[1] See vol. vi. pp. 34 sq.

[2] Comp. vol. vii. pp. 586 sq. *note*. But that this description as it now appears in the Mishna would necessarily be in a great degree unhistorical and vague, appears from the superstition with regard to the Temple which had already made itself felt: see *Pirqæ Abôth*, v. 5.

[3] E.g. Juda, son of Tæma, always prayed, 'Grant, O God, that Thy city may be built speedily in our days!' *Pirqæ Abôth*, v. 20.

[4] For what is taught regarding the king of Israel *M.* Sanhedrin ii. 2–5 is purely incidental, and introduced simply because the words Deut. xvii. 14–20 required his legal position to be referred to.

during the last centuries, and in the only form in which it could then be lawful, had no room for either.

As far as it could then be directly applied, the prevailing tendency of the legal framing of duty was to pursue it into the smallest detail. It appears, therefore, as if a man as a living member of this Community has absolutely nothing to do or to leave undone but what the Law determines, as if he must be protected and preserved, held in leading strings and trained in everything, by the sacred Law. An elaboration and extension of the Law in this form was, it is true, involved in the entire tendency of the Hagiocracy, and was especially favoured by the Pharisees; but it was now more rigorously carried out, and not without necessity. For if the members of the ancient Community still remaining were amid the troubles of the time and in their wide dispersion to be kept nationally united and separate from the rest of the world, and never to forget their national claims to a better future, it was necessary that they should be more strictly than ever before kept to such customs and usages as would promote this end. That the freedom of the individual mind and all true religion would be destroyed by the predominance of this Rabbinic tendency was what no one perceived, and in the course of the next centuries the remnant of the ancient Community submitted to it more and more completely, finding therein its hope and pride.[1]

And if we look more narrowly at the means which they employed in founding their system of interpreting and applying the sacred Law, we cannot form a more favourable judgment. Every party and every community when brought into circumstances of great difficulty, in order to maintain its existence, often suffers its spiritual vision to be dangerously narrowed and beclouded; if it is, moreover, driven from a previous position of greater freedom into such lasting difficulty and gloom, its spiritual eye is the more easily paralysed, and not only its mind and aims but its judgment also only too easily cling

[1] Until the tendency had at last completely unfolded itself and all its consequences were revealed to even the least observant. This happened under the new supremacy of Islam, when in the ancient Community itself the Karaites arose and rejected the Talmud. They first appear and found their own societies, it is true, at the beginning of the eighth century of our era but what they really aimed at was much earlier, and, in fact, is implied in the elements and fundamental principles of the ancient true religion. The Karaites flourished for centuries in the East, and their influence had such an effect upon the Rabbanites that learning revived amongst them in an entirely new form, as I perceived long since in reading Saadia's works. They continued all along to be much more conscientious and uncorrupted, though more timid, than the Rabbanites; and it is only because they were not bold enough to reach the full truth that they have declined in the last centuries, especially as during this period all spiritual life has been paralysed in the East.—Comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1862, pp. 595 sq.; 1865, pp. 767 sq.

spasmodically to the fragments of a better past. Thus in this instance the Law must not only retain its validity, but must, if possible, be more correctly understood and more faithfully kept than ever before; and the Biblical scholars have as Rabbis, that is Doctors belonging to a corporation, at last become the sole rulers of men's minds upon these principles, and have therefore all possible liberty to become spiritually thoroughly assured and secure on this basis. But they submit so completely to the narrow limitation and darkness of the situation that their chief principle becomes—*the sacred Law may be* interpreted and *taught only according to the ancient method* (now called *Halakha*) or (which is substantially the same) *according to the sacred tradition* (originally *Massôra*),[1] and that the great Rabbi Akîba (of whom we shall speak subsequently) could sum up all his wisdom in the words which his successors admired and followed: *Tradition is a fence for the Law, Tithes a fence for wealth, Vows a fence for piety, and for Wisdom the fence is silence*;[2] accordingly, with regard to all his best endeavours and possessions, a man must put certain restraints upon himself lest they become injurious to him; and a restraint of this kind, which he cannot in any case get over, is mere tradition even as regards the understanding, interpretation, application, and practice of the Law. Neither true freedom of mind nor true learning is possible even in their elements. The Rabbis endeavoured to interpret the Law, and to establish by means of it whatever they considered to be legally binding, but they had not any satisfactory knowledge of the Law to begin with; they observed certain rules of interpretation,[3] but never discovered the true principles of the science. They sought by a certain system of exegesis to reduce the various matters to be dealt with to some kind of unity,[4] and ended with the preliminary result, that they set up a confused mass of 613 laws as necessary according to sacred Scripture, 365 of them being prohibitions and 248 injunctions.[5] Of genuinely scientific principles and their

[1] According to the saying, 'The pestilence cometh mainly on account of those who do not teach according to the Halakha of the Law,' *Pirqæ Abôth*, v. 8 *ad fin.*: comp. iii. 11.

[2] *Pirqæ Abôth*, iii. 13. *Massôra* must not, of course, in this passage be understood in the restricted meaning which it bore in subsequent centuries; but in that restricted sense the Massôra was an outcome of the same spirit which we find here in its full strength. Similarly the word *Cabbala*, which had essentially the same meaning at first, has not as yet received the stricter significance which immortalised it subsequently; comp. *M.* תענית ii. 1. קבלה

[3] Eighteen rules for the interpretation of the Scriptures and the derivation of Laws from its language became specially famous; they were traced back to the time of Hillel and Shammai, but they have no great importance.

[4] The present division of the Mishna is later, but the basis of it was laid early.

[5] These 613 laws, which were mentioned early, are well known: the reduc-

valuable results we have here nothing; on the contrary, an increasing narrowness and obscuration of mind is specially observable in the fact, that the ideas, the sentences, the words, and even the particles and letters of the Scriptures are more and more frequently arbitrarily used as proofs, though it may be with surprising ingenuity.[1] And as in such times of distress the historical sense is so often sadly blunted and superstition rapidly grows, a previously unheard-of and Heathenish superstition creeps into the ideas and doctrines of the Rabbis.[2] At the same time the love of reducing everything conceivable to round numbers and of arranging simple things with their opposites makes rapid progress.[3] It is true all this does not occur for the first time in the Mishna period, but we have seen it gradually beginning before—for instance, in the case of the philosopher Philo; but the important thing is that it now makes such rapid progress and becomes so absolutely predominant.

A legislative mania of such a character was comparatively harmless as far as it concerned only those matters which could not find at the time any immediate application. The effect must have been quite different as far as it interfered with present affairs, and sought to prepare the hearts of people then living for the new age; although, as there was strictly nothing new to be enjoined, that which was proposed for the sake of the new state of things was for the most part expressed in the form of hints, general principles, and actual events, rather than of laws. Most of the laws which had been in force until the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the nation had for that reason to take a completely altered form; but a clear conception of the way in which they were to be either abrogated or amended was not arrived at; they remained accordingly fundamentally as they had been, and it was only timidly or clandestinely that an entirely different mode of procedure was gradually introduced in many points. It is told at length how hard the younger Gamaliel found it to resolve in the Council to admit as of full blood a proselyte of the people of Ammon, or rather from the country

tion of the prohibitions to exactly 365, the number of the days of the year, illustrates the arbitrary nature of the procedure; the endeavour to find 611 as the numerical value of the letters of the word תורה and the addition of 2 from the pre-Mosaic period to the 611, dates as far back.

[1] Take, for instance, *M.* Sanhedrin, 1–6, where the number 23 of the assessors of an intermediate court, which may be explained easily from ancient usages in Israel (see vol. v. p. 167), is accounted for in the most arbitrary manner from disconnected passages of Scripture.

[2] See e.g. the expressions with regard to the fallen Temple, *Pirqæ Abôth*, v. 5, or those on the scale of calamities as Divine punishments, v. 8 sq.

[3] An example is the number 613, just mentioned; a number of others of both kinds, *Pirqæ Abôth*, v. 3 sq.

where this people once dwelt;[1] and if the Christian rivalry in converting the Heathen had not then been feared, he would hardly have at last been admitted. The tithes and similar contributions would naturally have ceased with the destruction of the state; but as this could not be admitted as lawful, it was secretly urged the more energetically that they ought at all events to go to the Biblical scholars, if not to the Priests,[2] as the former alone then took pains to keep up the national union. But the Rabbis gave themselves special trouble to put difficulties in the way of, or wholly to prevent, as far as possible, any close contact of the Judeans with Heathen, and especially with Greek and Roman, culture. The laws regarding food were now repeatedly most carefully defined and made as stringent as possible;[3] and the horror of even the books of the Greeks and Romans became rapidly so great, after the Pharisees had set the example,[4] that from this time scarcely any Greek works were written or read in certain districts (such as Egypt, Italy, Asia Minor). But the Rabbinic spirit from this time rejected with bitter hostility, even in the formation of its laws, everything Christian, at all events dimly feeling how irreconcilable it was with the latter. The Minim, who, as we have seen,[5] might be simply all those who separated from the Community, and the heretics who were disowned by it, have become to the Rabbis the Christians, and in their two-fold character, both Heathen and Jewish Christians;[6] and a number of laws are issued against close intercourse with them; indeed, foul names of reproach for anything Christian become customary.[7]

It required, it is true, far greater courage in those days to go over to Christianity than to remain, amid all the evils of the

[1] *M.* Jadaim iv. 4.

[2] According to the pointed remark concerning tithes and those who were bound to pay them, *Pirqæ Abôth*, v. 8, 9. The saying ascribed to the elder Gamaliel, i. 16, *Tithe not too much by conjecture!* belongs, from its connection and its force, to the younger Gamaliel and the time under review.

[3] Thus it was long prohibited to buy bread and oil of the Heathen, as was the case before the destruction of Jerusalem, vol. vii. p. 537.

[4] As we may see plainly enough from the remarks of Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 11. 2 *ad fin.* Greek books were, however, not entirely forbidden before the time of the last wars (comp. the saying, *M.* Sota ix. 14, below); but the inclination towards this prohibition is already perceptible enough; and we shall meet below only two Greek works by Jewish authors, and one of the two books is not purely Jewish. The serious consequences of this we shall have to consider.

[5] *Ante*, p. 37.

[6] These two divisions of those 'who have cast off the yoke of the Law' are plainly distinguished, 2 Bar. xli. sq.

[7] *The disciples of Bileam the wicked*, *Pirqæ Abôth*, v. 19, are almost beyond doubt, in contrast with the *disciples of Abraham*, the Christians, as they are not characterised as Heathen; and somewhat early the word *Evangelium* was abbreviated by Rabbinic wit into *Aven*, ון, i.e. *evil*, which is almost as bad as the paronomasia mentioned vol. vi. p. 142.

time, faithful to Judaism, as the Judeans might still hope that the misery which had so suddenly come upon them would not last so long as that of the first destruction of Jerusalem, and as it was thought possible to contend—at all events under the form of teaching—against the prevailing Heathenism. We cannot see without admiration how a former Levite, Joshua the son of Chananja, a disciple of Jochanan son of Zakkái, after the loss of his hereditary honours and advantages, lived in the greatest poverty as needlemaker,[1] and yet found sufficient leisure and courage to become an unwearied teacher of his countrymen, and to gain the thanks of thousands. But, on the other hand, we must not be surprised that in consequence of the absence of the true bases of learning and exalted morality amongst these scholars, and especially amongst the more famous of them, so much bitter controversy, ambition, and contentiousness broke out that even Eliezer, the son of Hyrcanus, one of the five best disciples of Jochanan, chose as his motto, 'Warm thyself at the fire of the wise, but take care not to burn thyself with their coals, for their bite is that of the fox, their sting that of the scorpion, and their hissing that of the dragon.'[2] In spite of these internal controversies, however, the necessities of the time were such that almost all who declined to become either Heathens or Christians were compelled for a while to submit to them, and to find out the only possible method of holding closely together.

The Poetry and Prophecy of the New Period.

The Fourth Book of Ezra and the Second of Baruch.

If during these decades the mental life of the Judeans had shown itself nó further than in this new effort to maintain its existence by greater zeal in legislation and the teaching of the Law, the ancient Community would most likely have lost heart under the distresses of the time, and we should hardly have been able to understand how it could once more be animated by a bright hope and confident expectation with regard to the dark future. But although the sacred Law was now more decidedly than ever before ranked above everything else, and seemed to be the one inalienable visible possession of the Com-

[1] He taught at *Begûm*, a place not far from Lydda (*antè*, p. 33), just as Akiba taught afterwards somewhat farther to the south at Benae-Beraq, Jos. xix. 45; all the most famous teachers dwelt therefore at that time in this district, whilst later Galilee became the chief locality for their schools (see below).

[2] *Pirqæ Abôth*, ii. 10.

munity, it had never been, and was not now, its sole possession. True religion, with its power and its hope, is always far more than its written book of Law; and the mind of man, if it is to rise to nobler hope and labours, must be nourished with something better than even the best laws. In the consciousness of the ancient Community still lived deeply implanted the Messianic hope with its magic power; and the more unexpectedly the last great calamities had fallen upon them, the more unintelligible these sufferings of the 'people of God' seemed to the strongest minds of the Hagiocracy; and the more restless the entire existence of the nation had become, the more profoundly might many minds lose themselves in the abysses of this hope, and the pictures of the future might rise in more glowing colours before the eager glance of individual prophets. It was just here that the more deeply hidden life of the ancient Community still remained unexhausted. Prophecy, which had long ceased to be a public power, in consequence of the arrogance and frigidness of the Hagiocracy, had during the years immediately preceding the destruction of Jerusalem once more made itself heard against the will of the rulers;[1] it might now, in the forced silence of these calamitous days, more freely put forth its powers and attempt the utmost that was possible to it.

Three of the most important documents, and the fragment of a fourth, have come down to us showing that it actually made these exertions. The first two new prophetic books, still preserved almost entire, are most instructive, and in their form most admirable monuments of this final period; unlike as they are in some respects, proceeding though they do from widely separated localities and from very dissimilar minds, they were yet published almost simultaneously at the beginning of the reign of Titus, 80–81 A.D. And this cannot be accidental. As long as Vespasian reigned, dumb fear must have sealed the lips of poets and prophets: his death for the first time liberated somewhat their feelings, and encouraged the prophetic eye to penetrate more boldly the veiled future.

The first of these two pieces is a Sibylline poem,[2] which has come down to us complete, at all events as far as its main portion is concerned, and may be interpreted with a good degree of certainty. It was written in Egypt by a Judean; and it was precisely in this original home of Hellenism that the Judean communities had till now lived comparatively least disturbed. Just as most of the Judeo-Christian Sibylline books

[1] See vol. vii. pp. 516 sq.

[2] Sibyll. v. 52–530.

originated in this prolific soil,[1] so this one follows earlier models, and particularly the larger Judean work which had then been in circulation two centuries; but in other respects it is one of the finest of all these hybrid products of Judeo-Greek prophecy. We hear in it the aspirations of a nobler mind of these profoundly calamitous times; it lays hold spasmodically of the eternal hope of Israel, contending rather against Heathens than Christians; and though it anticipates the approach of a much darker day, or rather of the black night of the world's end, it still hopes the more firmly that the bright light of Israel's influence in the world will rise victoriously from the midst of the horrors of this night of judgment. All this is written with veiled but evident allusions to the time when, amid the eruption of Vesuvius and the earthquake in Italy, the conflagration of the world seemed about to take place. This product of a poet, in whose heart burns the deepest hatred of Rome, with the tenderest and most enthusiastic love for the fallen Jerusalem, and who possesses sufficient artistic power to control such intense feeling, is remarkable also, inasmuch as its author is the last genuine Hellenist from whom a Greek work has come down to us from a time when the use of the Greek language and style grew more and more rare.[2] And it would be necessary to say more with regard to this author if I had not elsewhere given a detailed account of him and his work.[3]

We must refer more at length to the other piece, *the Revelation of Ezra*, formerly often called the first, or the second, but now usually the *Fourth Book of Ezra*, a work which, in its ultimate meaning and purpose, is in full agreement with the above Sibylline piece, while in its plan and artistic execution it differs fundamentally therefrom. Whilst the latter, after the manner of former happier times, places Judaism in contrast with Heathenism in a general way only, the Revelation of Ezra, in accordance with the spirit prevailing in the new Judean schools, takes as its basis almost exclusively the sacred Law, complains of its neglect and violation,[4] and hopes for future salvation mainly from its more perfect observance. Whilst the former work is animated by a breath of delicate art, and rises to the elevation of genuine poetry, the latter is

[1] As I have shown at length in my *Abhandlung über die Sibyllischen Bücher*, Gött. 1858.

[2] See *ante*, p. 44.

[3] In the above-named *Abhandlung*.

[4] According to 4 Ezra iv. 23 the complaint might even be raised of the disappearance of the manuscripts of the Law, because the Romans burnt them, comp. v. 27; vii. 17–25; viii. 12, 56, 57; ix. 31–37; xiv. 21; as to the contemptible character of other nations, see vi. 56–59; viii. 26–30, 56–58 (Eth. vi. 53–56, 63–67); comp. 2 Bar. lxxxii.

the product of the more depressed spirit of the Rabbinical schools, wanders off into lengthy rhetorical, and often scholastic, elaborations, and finds it difficult to rise to pure and luminous art. Whilst the former is quite Hellenistic, the latter imitates the truly Hebrew prophetic books only, especially those of the later period, and was certainly written originally in Hebrew,[1] and probably not in Palestine itself, certainly not in Egypt, but, according to all indications, in Rome.[2] But though the author once more imitates the genuine Hebrew prophetic books, especially the Book of Daniel, and to some extent the Book of Enoch, it is nevertheless the spirit of the new Judean schools of law which prevails, and it is in that spirit he looks for the man of God whom he may most suitably make the author of his new prophecy.

For it is in an entirely original manner that our legalistic prophet, as if he were himself a Biblical scholar, chooses no other than Ezra, the venerated head of all Biblical scholars, to represent his ideas. The design of the book is in general simply to answer the question whether and when a Divine restoration of Jerusalem, with its commonwealth and Temple, and also a Divine castigation of the Heathen for the rejection of God's people and His Holy Law, is to be looked for—a two-fold question, which undoubtedly involves a hundred preliminary and subsidiary questions. The author had plainly

[1] The Hebrew original which is discernible in the errors of translation has been lost; and the Greek translation circulated so early amongst Christians, and was so much read amongst them during the persecutions of the second and third centuries, that many then placed the book almost on an equality with the sacred Scriptures, as we see from Clement's *Strom.* iii. 16, comp. 4 Ezra v. 35; i. 21, 22, compared with 4 Ezra xiv. and many other passages of the Fathers. At length the book was edited by a Christian, received an introduction, ch. i. and ii., with a completely Christian colouring, and the name *Jesus* was twice introduced into the sentences, vii. 28, 29, which are otherwise genuine. Thus the Greek translation, which has not come down to us, had been altered when the early Latin translation, still preserved, was made from it; but in addition to the latter we have now a Syrian, an Ethiopic, two Arabic, and one Armenian translation, and in my work *Das vierte Ezrabuch* (Gött. 1863) I have endeavoured to restore the original form of the book On many other points relating to the book, I have spoken at length in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1863, pp. 640 sq., 1864–74, and in the *Gött. Nachrichten* 1863, pp. 163 sq.; 1865, pp. 504 sq. [The long passage wanting in the old Latin translation between vii. 35 and 36 is now supplied from an ancient MS. at Amiens by Bensley, *The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation* of the Fourth Book of Ezra, Cambridge, 1875.]

[2] If we consider that according to iii. 1, 2, 28, 31, Ezra is described as in Babylon when he received these Divine thoughts, and as having been led to them in the first instance by the sight of the immense multitude of people in that city and of their conduct, it becomes probable that the actual author when he wrote this book was himself present in Rome and sent it forth from that city. Ezra himself, as far as we know, was never in Babylon, but in *regione Medorum, in regno Artaxerxis regis Persarum*, as the later Christian author of the preface, i. 2, remarks. The great caution with which the author speaks of Rome, venturing to mention Babylon only, or at most, vi. 9, *Esau*, accords with this view.

endeavoured, with the profoundest effort of his mind, to obtain light and Divine certainty on all these questions; and as he had obtained them he now sought by his book to make them known for the instruction and comfort of all his suffering co-religionists. His book became, therefore, naturally a prophetic one; and nevertheless he selected for his representative speaker an ancient and already sainted hero, who had never, according to all historical accounts, been a prophet, nor sought to be regarded as such. But, according to the general opinion of the Biblical scholars and Pharisees, Ezra was at that time looked upon as a prophet, though the last of sacred antiquity;[1] and he might, considering the rapid decline of all historical feeling,[2] be regarded as having once lived in the midst of the Babylonian captivity: thus he is here represented as living at Babylon thirty years after the first destruction of Jerusalem,[3] and as praying in the deepest despair for a Divine explanation of that calamity; and in so far he could be described as speaking, praying, and beseeching God for enlightenment in an entirely similar situation. As far as the essential subject-matter of the book is concerned, and throughout the whole of its chief part, Ezra is thus made the ideal of our literary Biblical scholar, who looks up to him with reverence, obtains inspiration from his memory, and desires to rise to his elevation, that from that height he may speak the more forcibly and effectively to his contemporaries.

In agonising prayer to God, Ezra obtains from Him higher

[1] As will be shown below in the history of the Canon.

[2] As was shown vol. iv. p. 164, and as is proved also by the *Séder 'Olam rabba* of not much later date; comp. thereon *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1853, pp. 1456 sq. [See also vol. i. p. 200.]

[3] We might conjecture that this thirtieth year, iii. 1, 29, is intended to denote simply about the middle of the 70 years of the exile, and that that number was intentionally chosen because the real author might suppose that when he wrote his book about half the period of the second destruction of Jerusalem had elapsed. However, this supposition is not indicated elsewhere in the book, but rather the contrary; and I have shown above (vol. v. p. 163, compared with *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1863, p. 648; 1865, pp. 1716 sq.) that this number 30 has, on the contrary, been shortened from 130 by a later limitation of the times. But as the author all along keeps in view the great historical relations of Jerusalem (following in this respect the Book of Enoch), he mentions by way of consolation that Jerusalem was even 3,000 years (not 30 merely), from the beginning of the world to the building of Solomon's temple, without sacrifices; for the reading 3,000 in the Syriac and Arabic translation, x. 45, 46, comp. ix. 43 sq., is undoubtedly correct. Elsewhere the author, according to xiv. 11, 12, like the Sibylline book of his time (see my *Abhandlung über die Sibyllenbücher*, pp. 49 sq.), presupposes twelve ages of the world, of which the tenth had not elapsed at the time of Ezra, i.e. in the exile; the eleventh, therefore, and the twelfth extend beyond the Persian and Græco-Roman time to the commencement of the Messianic age: the Ethiopic translation, it is true, has here only ten ages, but this reading appears to be less correct. The length of each of these ages of the world is, however, not given, manifestly because the author only copies this idea from earlier books.

communications through the Archangel Uriel, with whom he can discourse as with a celestial friend and teacher, and who promises him again and again new and higher revelations after constantly renewed devotional exercises. Into this simple plan the author introduces everything that he has to impart, whether as plain instruction or as veiled intimation. As the range of his work is somewhat extensive, he makes Ezra at first only with difficulty obtain from Uriel a few brief detached prophecies (as, according to Ezekiel's example in the Old Testament, the proper beginning of prophecy and oracles is the most difficult), until finally the archangel promises him greater revelations in the future. This first part[1] is thus merely preparatory, and contains only preliminary and tentative matter. Then in the three longest sections[2] the proper subject of the book—instruction concerning the events of the future—is so exhaustively handled, that in this respect nothing further remains to be said. In the first instance the rule of the Romans is especially indicated as the great crisis bringing in the close of the ancient world;[3] then, in the second instance, the coming of the Messiah particularly is touched upon, and this event, together with the nature of the universal judgment, is described with great particularity; and, in the third place, the difficult question is resolved whether and in what way the salvation of sinners is to be prayed for before God, together with the connected question as to who may hope for forgiveness and redemption.[4] As now this work has all the characteristics of the scholasticism of that time, we can perceive from these three chief sections quite clearly the nature of the teaching of this scholasticism with its love of symbols and round numbers. A prophetic book, however, must necessarily contain something more than the prayers of a wise saint and celestial communications in the form of simple instructions. This is felt by the

[1] iii. 1–v. 13.

[2] The second section extends clearly from v. 14–vi. 34; but the next from vi. 35–ix. 25 would have been too long in proportion, and now we can find from the other translations the true extent of this part of the whole book: as from vi. 77 (according to the numbering of the Ethiopic version) the subject-matter also is changed, we may justly assume that before this passage vi. 77 *Eth.* some lines had been omitted (probably in the Greek translation also) which contained the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth sections. In fact, this follows from the observation, vi. 35, that Ezra must fast strictly three times for seven days, according to the example Dan. x. 2, 3; one of these strict fasts is intended therefore to introduce each one of the three sections in which he receives the highest revelations in three stages; and this must have been briefly mentioned in the original text after v. 12. The book was generally very much mutilated early on account of its great length.

[3] vi. 7–10.

[4] Really we may easily perceive from the artistic plan and working out of the fundamental thought that the division of the book was originally as above stated.

author, and he accordingly gives in three subsequent sections three magnificent visions of a more strictly prophetical character. These are the visions concerning Jerusalem, Rome, and the Messiah,[1] as the three great living creatures with which each prophecy concerning the unfolding and development of the future is connected; and therewith the entire prophetic book attains its purest elevation. The work also finds its completion in these *seven* large sections; and undoubtedly the sacred number seven is intentionally chosen, our author showing elsewhere in various ways a great liking for it.[2] The author adds further a chapter about Ezra as the Divine Biblical Scholar and Collector or rather Founder of Scripture,[3] simply because in a work written in the name of an ancient hero reference was naturally made to his actual history, and because at that time (as we shall see below) the question of the number and collection of the sacred Scriptures was very warmly discussed.

This is in brief the substance of the work, the veiled representations of which not infrequently translate us vividly into the midst of that period of Israel's history with which we are occupied. When it relates, for instance, how Ezra after he had withdrawn several weeks into solitude, and, indeed, into the desert, is about again to retire from the people, and they, disturbed on that account, gather about him and with weeping ask 'how they had transgressed, that he also should forsake them; that he alone was left to them as a cluster from the vineyard,[4] as a light in a dark place, as a haven for the ship[5] emerging from the waves of the sea; whether they had not yet

[1] The three sections ix. 25–x. 59; x. 60–xii. 39; xii. 40–xiii. 59. The artistic plan is continued here only in so far that Ezra no longer fasts rigorously; he fasts now according to direction seven days only partially, ix. 23–28; he has then to wait in a similar condition only two days, x. 56–60, and finally once more seven days, xii. 39, 40, 51. All this is artistically arranged; and in order to receive visions it is needful that a man should be somewhat excited, whilst simple instruction is best received in the most sober state of mind.

[2] The most important thing is that the author assigns seven hundred years as the period of the victory of the true religion in the earth, and is therefore in so far no chiliast but a heptahecatontist: he took this view from the Book of Enoch (see my *Abhandlung* on this book, pp. 36 sq.) The correct number, 700, instead of 70 as in Arab. *b* (probably originally *a week* of 700, after Syr. Arab. *a*), is found in this sense vii. 40 (vi. 16 *Eth.*) in the Ethiopic translation; and it must also be restored, vii. 28, where the unintelligible number 400 is found in the Lat. and also in the Arab. translation; the Syr. has in this passage the still more incorrect number 30, and in the Ethiopic translation the number has unfortunately been wholly omitted. The proper sense of the passage is then, that as in the consummation one day corresponds to 700 years, so the Messiah will previously reign visibly 700 years, and something similar is implied 2 Bar. xl.

[3] xiv.; on which see further below. The division of time according to weeks is accordingly given up here. vv. 1, 45.

[4] The frequent symbol of the Community of God since the words Isa. v. 1.

[5] In Christian writers also the figure of the true church as the ark of Noah surviving all the storms of the ages becomes afterwards very frequent.

experienced evil enough; whether it were not better that they should have perished in the burning of Sion, as their brothers, who were not worse than they;'[1] who does not feel that we have here a more truthful representation of the better members of the nation of that time, and of their close adhesion to the remaining Biblical scholars, than any Talmudic reminiscence supplies? As it is of importance, however, to form as accurate a view as possible of this book, which is in many respects so weighty, it seems to us of use to explain more in detail the sixth of the above-mentioned sections, which supplies, under language of greatly veiled art, the most accurate indication of the true age, and, indeed, of almost the year in which the book was written. We are also transferred vividly into those times and the experiences of those who suffered under their heavy yoke; and we are in a position at the same time to perceive clearly from this instance to what a high degree of artificiality this form of literature had then been developed, and, indeed, had been necessarily developed under the pressure of the period.[2]

Anyone who about the year 80, in the reign of Titus, meditated with prophetic thought and inquiry on the condition of the Roman empire, as represented especially in the rapid succession of its past and probable future rulers, might anticipate much which with great probability involved its near overthrow. Ten or thirteen years previously the Judeans had fought against this empire under a vivid expectation that its Divinely necessary end was immediately impending; and however much had since been changed, most recent events once more greatly favoured such a belief. It is true that at the public triumph over the Judeans a splendid spectacle had been exhibited in Rome,[3] such as had never before been seen, and which could be forgotten least of all by the Judeans themselves: the three Flavian princes, as the true rulers of the time, had celebrated together this triumph in complete accord, Vespasian driving between his two sons; and the Imperial rule seemed then to be secured to them for long. But scarcely ten years afterwards Vespasian

[1] xii. 40–45, comp. previously v. 16–19, but less forcibly.

[2] xi. xii. As early as 1827 I had indicated the true historical meaning of this vision, which has been so often erroneously interpreted in recent times, but I now for the first time explain it more in detail; comp. *Jahrbb. der B. Wiss.* ix. pp. 240 sq. and my essay on *Das Vierte Ezrabuch*, pp. 6–20. The fact that the ancient translations are least satisfactory in this section may be easily explained; and it is especially misleading that in the Ethiopian version 'heads' instead of 'little wings' is always used; nevertheless many particulars can be better understood by a comparison of those translations.

[3] See vol. vii. pp. 610 sq.

had died, as was stated in a rumour [1] willingly accepted by the Jews especially, not without the plots of the one or the other of his two sons: Titus reigned, but, as was well known, greatly hated from the first by Domitian; and moreover neither of these two brothers had a son and heir. If a glance backwards was taken, it was found that from Cæsar to the first of the three connected Flavian emperors it was Augustus only who ruled for an unusually long period: of the rest, the reign of Tiberius only was over twenty years, those of Claudius and Nero only over ten years, those of all the rest, including Vespasian's, under ten years; in fact, most of the latter but very brief. The entire family of these Cæsars seemed, therefore, to be remarkably short-lived, and doomed to be so in the future, so that only a short reign could be anticipated for the remaining Flavians; and moreover the entire number of twelve until Domitian, as the last whose accession could be foreseen, seemed to be ominously round and complete. The mystery possibly involved in this number twelve appeared, however, to extend still further; just half of the twelve had been the emperors, ending with Nero, of the truest Imperial race; and whilst the reigns of these first six had been on the whole prosperous, the following six appeared as by their very origin insignificant, and as all destined to be of brief duration, as if the first six were to be widely separated from the latter six. So many characteristics and indications might, therefore, seem to our prophet as of a mysteriously Divine nature; and he was not the first of his time to seek and record guidance of this kind for an understanding of the terribly dark future. But he required at this point in his work a great suitable symbol which should combine the whole of these features.

Now, it is true that the writers of this time who took up afresh Old Testament prophecy were in the habit of interpreting the fourth or the final empire of the Book of Daniel as meaning the Roman empire; [2] but we can perceive in the case of our book how little that interpretation sufficed. For although the book refers to the Beast of Daniel, the author selects nevertheless a symbol more suitable for his vision and its rich figurative language, that of a wholly different creature, and yet one specially characteristic of the Roman empire—namely, an

[1] As we learn from the contemporaneous Sibylline poem, see *Die Abhandlung über die Sibyllenbücher*, p. 54; but our author, who might have the best information in Rome itself, makes him die simply under great torture, xii. 26.

[2] According to 2 Thess. ii. 3 sq.; Rev. xi. 7, xiii. 11 sq.; 4 Ezra xi. 39 sq.; xii. 11 sq.

Eagle.[1] This great symbol naturally presented itself, and no other could be so easily intelligible to the readers of the book. But if the author desired to connect all the above numerous and various characteristics with this figure of the eagle, it could only be done at the cost of the æsthetic portraiture of the reality; but such prophetic symbolic representations as the later prophets sketched were not meant for permanent pictures but only for surprising visions, one great symbol including a number of smaller ones, and one subordinate figure taking the place of another; as if the same magical changes that occur in actual history in slow succession only, passed at once before the longing eye of the spectator of the chief symbol; points, therefore, which are not in themselves quite clear must be explained in such additional remarks as may be necessary at every stage of the revelation. The first thing to be noted in this eagle is that he has twelve wings and three heads; for these three, of which again the middle one (Vespasian) is very prominent, are the three heads of the then ruling Flavian house, and appear therefore at the beginning as all *resting*, or just then enjoying peaceful supremacy; they are, it is true, included as Cæsars in the number twelve, and it is soon explained that the eagle may not only be seen to fly with all twelve wings, but that he also calls to each of his wings to watch at the right time, i.e. to act and to rule whilst the rest sleep;[2] but the three are important enough to receive special mention, although it is soon added that they reigned last.[3] Of the twelve, eight have short reigns (under ten years), and therefore in so far (if the figure of the wings is to be carried out) also short wings; accordingly, as this is something very essential in the entire eagle, on the front of it, opposite the twelve wings, on the left eight shorter wings are visible, which nevertheless proceed from the same series and as from the same roots as the twelve.[4] The small wings with short reigns are as such less fortunate, and on that account appear on the left; but of the first six Cæsars even the two with brief reigns (Cæsar and Caligula) with their whole family are yet to be regarded as comparatively fortunate, as the poet likewise foretells that Vespasian will surpass his two sons in prosperity; and of these two sons, Titus seems to him again doomed to be comparatively

[1] Which had been used earlier, in the Book of the Ascension of Moses, for the Roman empire (see vol. vi. p. 61), and much earlier for the older empires, Jer. xlviii. 40, xlix. 22; Ezek. xvii. 2; but it is our prophet who elaborates the symbol much more than Ezekiel.

[2] xi. 1, 2, 7, comp. with xii. 11–16.

[3] xi. 4, 9, comp. with vv. 23–35, xii. 1, 2, 21–30.

[4] xi. 3, 11, comp. with vv. 22–31, xii. 2, and especially xii. 19–21.

the more unfortunate. Thus the notion of the right hand as the more fortunate receives once more considerable significance;[1] and as soon as in the historical flying, i.e. movement and life, of the eagle, the first six of the twelve are invisible (dead), two of the eight small wings (Cæsar and Caligula) not only disappear on the left, on account of their brief reign, but all the twelve great wings are at once paralysed on the right side as by magic,[2] so that the eagle with the other six small wings and three heads can continue to move and live only in a very wretched fashion, although one individual of these having acquired greater liberty may once more perhaps extend itself on the right. And after the fall of the first six a terrible commotion and revolution occurred in the Roman empire such as had not been witnessed since Cæsar's time, and they still terrified that generation like the subterranean disturbance of Vesuvius. Thus the noise, which as a matter of history arose at this point, proceeding from the midst of the eagle-monster itself, belongs to the essential properties with which the eagle is invested;[3] and, pitiable as the six subsequent little wings are, there is still all this noise about the government amongst them. But of these six (as if they all lived contemporaneously) two (Titus and Domitian) forthwith separate themselves from the other four, to put themselves under the protection of that one of the four which extends to the right (Vespasian). Then the first two of these six small wings erect themselves and are soon exhausted, the second (Otho) more quickly than the first (Galba);[4] the next two fight for the supremacy, but whilst the middle one of the three heads (Vespasian) takes the other two heads (Titus and Domitian) under his protection,[5] he vanquishes

[1] The right hand having this significance elsewhere in our book, as well as in others belonging to the first century A.D.

[2] This is the meaning of the description xi. 12–23; but we must read *ejus capita* v. 23 instead of *duo capita*, the Ethiopic preserving still the right reading. It is undoubtedly surprising that the three verses 19–21 with all the superfluous words describe only the three reigns of Caligula, Claudius, and Nero; but the author had nothing particular to say about them, though it was important to indicate, that since several wings could arise at once, all the twelve wings on *the right* had become lamed immediately after the six.

[3] This is the meaning of the words xi. 10, comp. with xii. 17, 18; it is true, the sense is not expressed very clearly in the translations especially, but appears to follow quite plainly from the general connection.

[4] xi. 24–27, comp. with xii. 21; the repeated plural *secundæ* velocius quam *priores*, xi. 27, supplies no meaning, and must be changed for the singular after the Ethiopic.

[5] The words xi. 24, 28–32, comp. xii. 2, 22–24, 29, 30, must yield this picture, which was so important for our author and his time; but the Latin translator has done his work at this point very far from clearly, and, indeed, scarcely intelligibly; and it is not surprising that errors soon multiplied; for it is necessary instead of *quatuor* to read *duæ alæ* (otherwise *pennacula*) *illæ quæ ad eum transierant* (in the Ethiopic translation the number has been entirely left out), and the previous clause must be restored as follows, *ecce perjit quod supererat caput et non*, &c. The translations which have since been

the two small wings before him at once,[1] until, after this middle head had once again established the most powerful supremacy, though but for a short time, and the head on the left (Titus) reigns, this head is devoured by that on the right (Domitian), while then the Lion (the Messiah) comes to destroy the entire creature and to prepare for the last judgment.[2] With this the complicated symbolic picture is completed. But while it must, in the first instance, be brought as a connected whole before the mind of the spectator, so as suddenly to surprise him,[3] it is then more elaborately described in relation to all its phases from its commencement to its end;[4] and inasmuch as even then the astonished spectator finds much that is obscure, everything is finally interpreted as far as the nature of such a prophecy permits.[5]

Such is this apparently too complicated symbolic picture, which is so mysteriously presented perhaps from both a desire to imitate previous Apocalyptic models and a prudent endeavour to conceal as much as possible things so boldly uttered under the eyes and in the immediate neighbourhood of the reigning emperor. Yet for eyes sufficiently skilled in reading such enigmas the picture is plain enough; and it is no less certain that it was published with the whole book during the reign of Titus. It might be conjectured that it was not written before the commencement of Domitian's reign, as many supposed that Titus fell by the treachery of the latter; but as our author makes him fall by his brother's sword,[6] which was not the form of his death, and as he shows himself in other respects to be well versed in the history of these years, he appears rather to have written before the death of Titus. In either case the difference would not amount to more than a year or so.

We have a fourth, though very mutilated, document in proof of the productivity of this literary prophetic activity in our period. We refer to the piece which has been preserved in the ancient Latin translation of the above Revelation of Ezra,[7] and which may have been attached to the latter by the same Christian editor that prefixed to the Revelation the existing Christian introduction.[8] This piece has, however, nothing

discovered and compared only confirm more and more the above interpretation of the limbs of the eagle.

[1] That is, supposing the reading, xi. 31, *duas subalares*, which appears substantially in the Ethiopic, is correct, and that the singular, which accords better with vv. 27, 28, was not the original reading.

[2] The *Lion*, xi. 36–xii. 1, comp. xii. 31–34, just as in Rev. v. 5 sq.

[3] This first and shortest part of the whole description, xi. 1–11.

[4] The second or historical part, xi. 12–xii. 2.

[5] The third part, xii. 3–38.

[6] xi. 35; xii. 2, 27, 28.

[7] 4 Ezra xv. xvi. The other early translations are without this piece.

[8] See *ante*, p. 48.

Christian in it, but is only a fragment of a genuinely Judean book of prophecy, which may have been written about 116 A.D. or a little earlier; for it is likewise directed especially against Babylon, i.e. Rome;[1] complains as much as the Fourth of Ezra of the violation of the 'elect of God,' i.e. the members of the Israelite Community; foresees, full of terrible threats, the certain commencement of the last judgment in the great commotions of the world just experienced; and admonishes the 'beloved of God' to be prepared at any moment for this final decision. This prophet of evil wrote probably at the time of Trajan's Arabian and Persian wars, and, like the Sibylline poet in Egypt,[2] but unlike the two previous writers, he revives only the simple language of the ancient prophets,[3] and takes especially Jer. l. li. as his model. Like that of a man overtaken by the most intolerable calamities, the lamentation and threatenings of which he cannot exhaust, his discourse is greatly drawn out, and could on that account be the more easily abbreviated greatly afterwards.[4]

But the most remarkable thing in this connection is that the same author who wrote the above Book of Ezra during the brief reign of Titus, subsequently, when he might see that his prophecy had not been perfectly fulfilled under this emperor, published in the reign of Domitian another book of a very similar character and with a similar purpose. This is the *Revelation of Baruch*, which was only quite recently discovered. By its literary art and arrangement, as well as by the rhetorical redundancy of its descriptions, no less than by the details of its figures and style, it points plainly to the same writer and the same place of origin—Rome; but (as if the author had been unable to excel himself in this form of art) it remains somewhat behind the first book in point of force and elaboration of style. The book, which we may call the *Second Book of Baruch*,[5] was therefore less read in the West, somewhat more in the East, which for a special reason readily adopted it,[6] and it has come down to us in a complete form only in a Syriac

[1] xv. 43, 46; xvi. 1.

[2] According to the words xv. 10, 12, comp. xvi. 1, Egypt was the land most immediately before him, and it seems to him as if the ancient Mosaic times were revived, as Israel is again not permitted to dwell longer in castigated Egypt, but must leave it according to the Divine will.

[3] But he introduces many new names by which his age can be discerned, as *Asia* xv. 46, xvi. 1. Many sentences, however, have been obscurely translated, as xv. 25.

[4] I have spoken further on this fragment in *Jahrbb. d. B. W.* xii. pp. 222–6. The words xv. 5 appear to be a re-echo of Rev. vi. 3–8, but need not have been taken thence.

[5] For the reasons stated in *Prophets of the Old Testament*, vol. v. p. 114.

[6] Because the smaller second half of the book was intended solely for the East, as we shall see.

manuscript, but in this in a very good text.[1] The great two-fold enigma which this book is intended to solve is that which was then incessantly occupying the mind of the Israelites: why Israel has fallen so low as compared with the Heathen, and when it may look for its Divinely promised deliverance. And only because the book lays upon all the members of the Community far and wide the most urgent exhortations to keep the Law of God much more faithfully than ever they had done before, does it venture to promise afresh the Divine mercy, and to describe a near fulfilment of the Messianic hopes in conformity with assurances won in earnest prayer. But as the author could not well introduce Ezra a second time, he revives the recollection of Baruch, by the aid of whose honoured name, as that of a man of God who was half a prophet and much occupied with sacred Scriptures, previous prophetic authors had derived encouragement.[2] By the choice of Baruch, the time shortly before and after the first destruction of Jerusalem was assigned him as the chronological framework in which he had to inclose all that was presented to him to see and to hear;[3] but that period had so much similarity with that of the author himself that it accorded with the latter equally well, and the latter often comes plainly to the surface.[4] But we have not in this book, as in that of Ezra, a line of twelve Roman emperors; still, the last prince whom the Messiah will vanquish,[5] as is quite abruptly promised, is Domitian, just as if this was taken for granted from the former work; and the last of the four empires, which are mentioned more emphatically than in that work,[6] is the Roman, in accordance with the conception of all the contemporary interpreters of the Book of Daniel. And inasmuch as the author describes the twelve ages, as then popularly received,[7] in an original manner as an alternation of turbid and clear waters,[8] he conceives the eleventh age as the turbid one of the actual time of Baruch, the twelfth as the clear one of the second Temple, which is followed by an extra

[1] From the Ambrosiana, but at present only in a Latin translation from the Syriac published in Ceriani's *Monumenta sacra et profana*, i. 2 (Milan, 1866), pp. 73–98. I treated almost every point of this matter in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1867, pp. 1706–17, 1720. [Since this note was written (1868), Ceriani has published the Syriac text of the Apocalypse of Baruch in his *Monum. sac. et prof.* (Mediol. (1871), and again in his photo-lithographic edition of the Ambrosianus Codex (1883.] Special evidence of the use of this book in the East is supplied by the *Third Book of Baruch* to be mentioned below.

[2] See vol. v. pp. 207 sq.

[3] According to i. 1, in the twenty-fifth year of King Jeconiah; instead of this year, it ought to have been the eleventh; but the error is similar to that at the commencement of the Book of Ezra, *ante*, p. 49.

[4] E.g. xxxii. lxix. sq.

[5] xl.

[6] xxxix.

[7] See above, p. 49.

[8] lvi–lxx.

intensely turbid time, as one extending beyond the fixed limits, namely the time of the author, the purpose of which is, however, only to serve as the dark background for the approaching Messianic glory.[1] But other chronological hints are interspersed to indicate as clearly as possible the time of Domitian.[2]

There is one thing particularly which distinguishes this book in a marked manner from its companion work. Like the latter, it was written in Rome and intended primarily for the Roman empire; but as if there had been some special and vivid recollection of the co-religionists scattered through the Parthian empire, we find here, after the work has been finished in seven sections,[3] that the needful exhortations are addressed, as in an extra section, or a smaller second half, to 'the nine and half tribes beyond the River,'[4] in a letter which the Eagle[5] is commissioned to carry thither in rapid flight (of course, from the place —Rome—where he then was). This is the long postscript of the work which was by degrees read more frequently amongst the Eastern Christians alone, and as connected somewhat more closely there with the Bible came across our path in an earlier part of this work.[6] It is only recently that we have been placed in a position for understanding fully the origin of this disconnected piece. The artistic character of this Apocalyptic book, like all similar works, receives its final completion by the ascription of immortality to the prophetic hero of the book;[7] and wreaths of immortality were never better deserved than those which are awarded by this literature.

If we inquire more particularly as to the possible effect of this revived prophetic activity, we may easily suppose that the new prophetic books which were widely distributed and read rekindled the flagging courage of the scattered members of the nation, and inspired their minds with new and more definite hopes. It seemed really as if the well-known and sacred voices of prophecy were once more heard, and they were listened to the more gladly as they spoke more intelligibly to the entirely altered times. But these voices now promised with a new and full certainty that the long-expected Messianic

[1] lxvii–lxxiv. A confirmation of the views advanced on Dan. ix. in *Prophets of the Old Test.* vol. v. pp. 271 sq., 282.

[2] I do not wish to repeat here what I have said *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1867, pp. 1707 sq.

[3] These seven sections appear ch. ix. xii. xx. xxx. (where the customary closing words have simply been lost), xlvii. lxxvi.

[4] lxxvii–lxxxvii. But in 4 Ezra xiii. very much the same language is used.

[5] This Eagle reminds us thus of 4 Ezra xi. xii.

[6] Vol. v. p. 209.

[7] xiii. xxv. lxxvi., comp. the close of 4 Ezra and the Ascension of Moses. The latter book (see vol. vi. pp. 51 sq.) is plainly alluded to ch. lix. of our book.

deliverance[1] would come *very quickly*;[2] and we shall soon see that such burning words greatly fired men's minds. Unfortunately, all the recent prophetic voices of this kind were directed almost exclusively against the world as hostile and deserving the wrath of God simply because it had done wrong to the people for whose sake the world had been created.[3] They do not lead the nation to a clear perception of the sins of its own past life, and of the new and better things to be striven after in the future; and while the prophets stand in this important matter far below the great anonymous prophet of the Exile,[4] we observe that they are unable to free themselves from the yoke of their Pharisaic education, which, as by a charm, so much fetters all who desired to be devout without becoming Christians. The revived Ezra-Baruch readily confesses, it is true, that even the living 'elect ones' sinned much; indeed, he expresses only too many distressing thoughts regarding the absolutely unavoidable sinfulness of all men since Adam;[5] but he has no better advice to give to these 'elect' than to observe in the future more faithfully than ever all the commandments and prohibitions of God, which, having once been given, so beneficially guard the entire conduct of every man;[6] and to him also the *Law*, i.e. the Pentateuch, and with it *Wisdom*, namely the exegetical wisdom of the schools, is the highest thing.[7] And if these prophets even, who were most able with all their ideas and imaginations to rise to the freest heights, were unable to give the miserable people any better advice than this, and if they even did not dare to touch the framework of the Hagiocracy, which had for upwards of six centuries thrust itself more and more between the 'people of God' and the true

[1] It appears especially xv. xxix. xxxix. sq. lxx. how fully the Book of Baruch harmonises with that of Ezra as regards the Messiah, comp. vol. vi. p. 115. He will vanquish the *last prince* (of Rome) on Sion itself, xxix. xl. lxx.; to what extent he is a chiliast appears from the remark *ante*, p. 51. As regards the *Resurrection*, comp. xxi. xxx. xlix. sq lxxii. But it can hardly be inferred from the use of *verbum* 2 Bar. lvi. that he introduced the idea of the Logos: all who were not Christians must have had a horror of this conception.

[2] 2 Bar. xx. xlviii. and elsewhere, just as in the Apocalypse.

[3] Thus 2 Bar. xiv. sq. xxi. xlviii. in agreement with the Fourth of Ezra.

[4] See vol. v. pp. 42 sq.

[5] The universality of human sinfulness on account of the original sin of Adam is dwelt upon so emphatically by no previous Jewish author known to us; 4 Ezra iii. 7–10, 20–26; iv. 30; vii. 46–48 (vi. 45 Eth.); viii. 34, 35, and elsewhere, 2 Bar. xxiii. liv. sq. It does not follow from this, however, that our author borrowed this idea from Rom. v. 12 sq., still less that he was a Christian. The passage iv. 7, 8, also is very similar to Rom. x. 6, 7, and yet was not taken from the latter. We simply learn from all such instances the great similarity in many respects of the Jewish and Christian writings of the first century.

[6] See the chief passage 4 Ezra vii. 20–24.

[7] E.g. 2 Bar. xix. xxxviii. xli–xliv. xlviii. lxxvii. lxxxiv. sq. He regards it as exemplary that Josiah left no *uncircumcised* man in the land, lxvi.

living God himself, what could become of the people whom they had to teach and to inspire? The impression which these writings make upon us is, however, the more divided as we hear plainly enough from many of their phrases and descriptions that their authors had read some of the books of the New Testament, and find ideas from the latter re-echoed unintentionally in them.[1] But they could not forget that the Judeans, as the people of God, had just then seen practically all nations submitting to them and their Law, and merely the terrible giant, Rome, had resisted them.[2]

The Historical Literature of the Judeans.
Josephus as the Apologist of his People.

If the Jewish scholars of this time had endeavoured to establish a truly historical acquaintance with the entire situation and peculiarities of their nation, they might still have perhaps been able, at this decisive moment when so much darkness had to be cleared away, to do very good service for the future of their country. If they had been competent, and had possessed self-denial and industry enough, after the calamities which had for the time put an end to the political history of the nation, to look more deeply into the full significance of that history and its marvellous course of two thousand years, they would have perhaps now been able to extract from its mysterious depths the most salutary truths, to give currency to more correct views of this ancient nation amongst the Heathen, and especially to present to the nation itself the best instruction regarding the past and the safest outlook into the future. The history of no nation had ever been more instructive and necessary as regards true religion generally. But if we here review all the various endeavours which had been made in the centuries preceding the second destruction of Jerusalem for this object, with the view of giving the Heathen some clear knowledge of the history of Israel, we find that they were far from satisfactory, and, indeed, that the various works which, whether

[1] The above-quoted passages concerning Adam have great resemblance to Rom. v. 12 sq., 2 Ezra to Rom. x. 6, 7; and 2 Bar. xviii. xlviii. lix. we find much reminding us of the New Testament; the phrase *accepimus legem ab uno* (deo), 2 Bar. xlviii. reminds us strongly of Gal. iii. 19, 20. Still, these are only unintentional re-echoes; and we must not forget that Paul proceeded from the same school of the Pharisees. It may further be asked whether the Fourth Book of Maccabees, referred to vol. vii. p. 485, was not written at this time: as J. Freudenthal has recently shown [*Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft*, &c. Breslau, 1869] we have not yet a very good text of it.

[2] Consider particularly the simile of the *cedar*, i.e. Rome, and the *vineyard*, i.e. Sion, which is worked out at length 2 Bar. xxxvi. sq., comp. lxxxii.

written by Israelites or by Heathen, touched briefly or at length on the history of Israel, contributed themselves in no small degree to increase the great confusion of these last times. It is, therefore, worth while to show this more in detail, as far as we can do so by the aid of the undoubted traces of these works still remaining; for scarcely one of the works which belong specially to this subject has come down to us intact.

We have before observed[1] that the peculiarities and the sacred treasures of the Judeans and Samaritans were described with increasing frequency by Greek authors from the time of Aristotle and Alexander, and that afterwards Hellenists early endeavoured on their part to commend in Greek to the educated world both the glories of Jerusalem or Samaria and the religions of those capitals. Down to the times of the Maccabees this literature continued to be fairly impartial on both sides, and it was almost exclusively love of knowledge and interest in the remarkable national peculiarities of Israel which inspired both Greek and Hellenistic readers and writers. But after the Græco-Judean troubles in the second century B.C. had created great animosity on both sides, and the Maccabean victories had given new stimulus to the confidence of the ancient people as against the Heathen world, we see the literary undertakings and labours of both sides assuming more and more a national animus. The mutual alienations and misunderstandings, not to say passions and bad words, which were thereby rendered possible, increased rapidly; and literature did not simply follow in the wake of this growing ill-will, but led the way in it with ever increasing provocation.

It cannot be denied that the Heathen authors who treated Judean affairs incidentally or in special works proceeded with little accuracy and certainty of knowledge.[2] They could not pierce the thick rind which at that time enveloped the religion,

[1] Vol. v. pp. 247 sq., pp. 260 sq.

[2] As less trustworthy authors Josephus, *Contra Ap.* i. 23, enumerates Theophilus (he was probably a Phœnician, as according to Alex. Polyhistor [Euseb. *Præp. Evan.* ix. 34] he spoke of Hiram and Solomon, as was likewise the prophet Cleodemus Malchus, to judge from this name, according to Alex. Polyhistor, *apud* Jos. *Ant.* i. 15), Theodotus (probably the poet, see vol. v. p. 260), Mnaseas Hermogenes (probably of Smyrna, in his Ἀσίας κτίσεις, C. 1, G. ii. 3311), and (the Mythographists) Euhemerus, Conon, Zopyrion. As those who deserve more confidence he mentions in addition to Hecateus (referred to vol. v. p. 247), Demetrius Phalereus, Philo the Elder (or Philo simply in Clement *Strom.* i. 21, not the poet, vol. v. p. 260, comp. vol. vii. p. 207), and Eupolemus; the latter was therefore, unlike the Eupolemus mentioned vol. v. p. 322, a Heathen, or rather, according to the extracts in Polyhistor, Eus. *Præp. Evan.* ix. 17, 26, 30, 34, 39, a Samaritan, the Samaritans often being reckoned with the Heathens by the Judeans. Other writers were mentioned above, vol. ii. pp. 85 sq. In the time of Sulla, Cornelius Alexander Polyhistor, a grammarian of Miletus, who came to Rome as a prisoner, and was set at liberty by Sulla, compiled chiefly from such sources his lengthy work περὶ Ἰουδαίων, from which Euseb.

and with it the characteristics, of this nation; for this reason they could take no true view of either its earlier or later history. On that account the Judean historians ought to have devoted themselves to the grand ancient history of their people, and to have learned the true solution of the difficult problems it contained. But they did not do this. It is true that in the calmer early period they often took pains to present many details more accurately in their books than the above Heathen or semi-Heathen authors did. Thus a Jew, or rather a Samaritan,[1] living in Egypt sought about 210 B.C. in an historical work to fix also the chronology of the history of Israel, and to reconcile it with the system in vogue;[2] and subsequently Eupolemus wrote in Egypt a chronology from Adam, embracing extensive historical works.[3] Of other historians we know too few accurate details.[4] But such writers never penetrated to the true meaning and teaching of the national history, having been kept from this mainly by the prevailing Pharisaic tendency, to which all historical inquiry affecting matters of faith must have been without interest or repugnant. The prejudices and misunderstandings which arose amongst the Greeks regarding Jewish affairs were on that account naturally confirmed, and this most disastrously in the case of some writers who enjoyed in their day great reputation as clever and learned men, and whose writings were widely read.

Two famous Rhodians of the time of Cicero, and widely known through his writings, must be mentioned first in this connection. They are the Stoic philosopher Posidonius, who, as born at Apamea, in Syria, might claim considerable

Præp. Evan. ix. 17–20, 21–37, 39, quotes so much. [See now Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltene Reste Judäischen Geschichtswerke.* Breslau, 1875.]

[1] See vol. i. p 212.

[2] E.g. he fixed 128½ years as the time between the destruction of Samaria and of Jerusalem (vol. iv. p. 206); see the extracts from him in Alexander Polyhistor referred to vol. i. p. 212.

[3] Extensive fragments from Eupolemus have been preserved especially through the above-named Alexander Polyhistor, *apud* Clement *Strom.* i. 21, p. 404, 413 (ed. Potter), and Euseb. *Præp. Evan.* ix. 17, 26, 30–34, 39. He wrote, so far as we can see from these extracts, two lengthy works, the one *On the Assyrian*, i.e. Syrian, i.e. Palestinian *Judeans*, whom he thereby manifestly contrasted with the Egyptians, and the other *On Elijah's Prophecy*, unless this work was a portion of the former. It follows from the mention of the fifth year of the reign of a Ptolemy XII. in which he concluded his work, that he wrote in Egypt; and in that case he did not write long before Alexander Polyhistor. But the names with the entire text are in this passage as in so many others of the *Strom.* unfortunately very uncertain and obscure.

[4] The Aristeas (*apud* Polyhist. Euseb. *Præp. Evan.* ix. 25) who wrote the history of Job, following the LXX, was probably also a Judean. We know least of the *six books of Jewish history* by Teucrus of Cyzicum, who, according to Suidas, wrote also a Mithridatic history; he probably did not write before the second century A.D., but, as I remarked *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1859, p. 1141, knew the East well. The same is true of Euphorus in Clement *Strom.* p. 404, and of Claudius Iolaus, who spoke much about Judeans in his Φοινικικά, according to Stephan. Byz.

acquaintance with the Judeans, and the rhetorician Apollonius, generally called Molon, who also went to Rome.[1] The former had probably only repeated in his large historical work the bad opinions which many Greeks cherished regarding the Judeans; but the latter, habituated to the arts of an advocate, had with greater unfairness collected everything that could be said against them. Hence Josephus, in his apology, replies to Molon with special vigour.[2] Both these authors had confined themselves very much to the injurious legends of recent times regarding the Judeans; but Lysimachus, an Alexandrian, in the accusations in his history of Egypt, with great zest made use of the charges which could be taken from the traditions of ancient times.[3] But it was another Egyptian, Apion, with the proud surname of *Plistonices*, who first fully opened the floodgates of this stream of Egyptian calumny, when through the recent conflicts between the Judean and the Græco-Egyptian inhabitants of Alexandria in the reign of Tiberius[4] so much ill-will had accumulated. Apion, who, led by his personal vanity, sought to outbid the intolerable inanity and mental feebleness of his time, who could not live without the noise of the popularity of the hour, and flattered himself that without his assistance nothing could acquire fame in the ancient and modern world, was astute enough to hunt up certain ridiculous points in the customs of the Judeans of that day, and aimed at acquiring no little honour by pouring upon them incessantly shafts of ridicule, and by persecuting them with malicious hatred. He was by profession a grammarian, and imagined that he appreciated the beauties of Homer better than anyone else. He accordingly collected audiences in Rome and then in all the cities of Greece, getting himself also made a citizen of the latter, and obtaining in every way other signs of popular admiration.[5] When therefore in the reign of Caligula the bitter conflict between Judeans and Egyptians in Alexandria had just reached its height,[6] and both parties had brought the matter before the Imperial court, Apion got himself sent by the

[1] Both are thus mentioned together in Jos. *Contra Ap.* ii. 7, the latter only 2, 14, 33, 36, 37, 41.

[2] We know his book only from the passage on the history of Abraham in Alex. Polyhistor, Euseb. *Præp. Evan.* ix. 19.

[3] See with regard to him vol. ii. p. 86. Nicharcus, son of Ammonius, who related, according to the fragment in *Bekkeri Anecd.* p. 381, 28–31, that Moses was so called because he had many white spots on his body (evidently in confusion with the name Miriam from μαραίνω), also belonged probably to this class of calumnious authors.

[4] See vol. vii. pp. 250 sq.

[5] We get these as well as other particulars from the writings of Seneca, Pliny, and other Romans, because the man had made so much noise in Rome for a long time. The Heathen Greeks have little to say about him.

[6] See vol. vii. pp. 250 sq.

Alexandrians as their representative and advocate before Caligula, and thus came at his court into sharp collision with Philo, who far surpassed him in learning and character.[1] He wrote also a work entitled *History according to Nations*, in which he was able without restraint to treat of the virtues or vices of each separate nation according to his own ideas. In this work an entire book is devoted to the Judeans,[2] and it was the most savage and shameless that had ever been written against them. In the reign of Claudius he was still living in Rome, but died long before the Judean war with Rome broke out. His book against the Judeans, which has not come down to us, was at the time widely circulated; and if his reputation in the world long survived him,[3] he owed it evidently mainly to this book and the sensation which it produced: the world, which regarded the Judeans with hostility, or at all events with suspicion, found in it what it wanted.

When we come to examine more closely all the charges laid against the Judeans in books of this description, as they are known to us fully and accurately enough,[4] we find most of them rest upon gross historical and other misunderstandings, such as naturally arise in connection with such persistent hostilities between nation and nation, and are often zealously propagated, and, when once received, are so hard to uproot. The gross misunderstandings and perversions chiefly of the early history of Israel in Egypt previously described [5] still play an important part in the national jealousies, and, indeed, in the street conflicts, of this entirely different period: other malicious legends of a more recent date had their origin purely in ill-will and excited imaginations.[6] But the worst of the matter was, that on the part of the Judeans there was no one who could so

[1] See vol. vii. p. 254.

[2] As the heading of his principal work is known to us from Suidas, we may very well suppose that the books on the Egyptians and Judeans that are quoted under these names were simply parts of it.

[3] He is, for instance, introduced into the Clementine Homilies as an important man; but he is meant simply to represent the boastful Egyptian magician, a part to which he had no historical claim.

[4] Especially from the writings of Josephus against Apion: the charges made against the Judeans from the days of Antiochus Epiphanes are briefly and well summarised in Diodorus Sic. *Hist.* xxxiv. 1.

[5] Vol. ii. pp. 84 sq.

[6] Of these stories the worst was to the effect that when King Antiochus had at last obtained entrance into the Temple he found in it a man lying before a table spread sumptuously with birds, that the man then most earnestly besought the king to save him from impending death, saying that he was a Greek (i.e. a Heathen), had come into the country without suspicion and had been thrown into chains, that first he was plentifully fed, but only to be sacrificed at the end of a year and serve as a sanguinary offering amid solemn oaths of undying hatred to all Heathen. This story, recurring elsewhere in various forms, Apion had also placed in his book, and Josephus following him mentions it in his book against him, ii. 8, but seeks to refute it in a very unsatisfactory fashion; others, e.g. Damocritus in his book against the Judeans mentioned by Suidas (*Lex. s.v.*), say that the fattened man was

much as correct in the right way these historical perversions, none being sufficiently skilled in history to do this. For if any Judean of that time had been able to refute convincingly such unjust aspersions, it would have been Philo, who lived, as we know, in the midst of these violent contentions; who was, in point of profound wisdom, piety, and humanity, incomparably superior to Apion; and who, moreover, was neither wanting in the purest desire to serve his people nor in literary skill and practice. However, we saw in the former volume how little he was able to do that which was required in this respect. And, after all, the other aspersions were more injurious —that the nation was unlike all others, that in morose arrogance it avoided all association with them, and that it adhered blindly to laws which were from the beginning made to keep it separate, such as the laws regarding food, in themselves so ridiculous, and the law of circumcision, &c.[1] For, however much obscurity and exaggeration there was in these aspersions, as directed against the prevalent Pharisaic spirit, they were not without foundation; and they were on that very account much more persistently and universally put forward than those first mentioned. But we saw in the preceding volume that Philo was unable satisfactorily to refute them, for the reason that he himself had not the strength to free himself from the Pharisaic spirit. And as a consequence these increasing misunderstandings and national hostilities contributed in no small degree to the outbreak of the last great war.

The remnants of the nation had, therefore, now to drink

to have been sacrificed in the Sabbatic year and eaten piecemeal. One basis of this story is undoubtedly to be sought in the sacred sacrificial table which stood in the sanctuary spread with food for seven days (*Antiquities*, p. 27), and the use of which people by degrees ceased to understand; another basis lay in the conception of sacrifices entertained by the Heathen; and the cement for the combination of both in the story was supplied by the hatred and suspicion of the Judeans. Very early, as we know, the suspicion of Thyesteian banquets was similarly raised against Christians because the Heathen populace could not comprehend what was the purpose of the Lord's Supper, and always heard so much of the Crucified One in connection with it. It was also said that Antiochus Epiphanes discovered in the Temple a golden ass's head as the real object of Judean worship (Jos. *Contra Ap.* ii. 7, 9; Minutius Felix, *Octav.* ix. 3; Epiphan. *Hær.* xxvi. 12, xxviii. 7; and Damocritus in Suidas, comp. Diodor. Sic. xxxiv. 1); the origin of this brutal Heathen notion, or rather its resuscitation now, may be gathered from vol. ii. p. 87.

[1] Of the charges of this second class the most serious, and for us also the most obscure, is (Jos. *Contra Ap.* ii. 10) 'that the Jews swore by the Maker of heaven and earth and sea to bear no goodwill to any one of foreign race (or faith).' As this is definitely described as an evil form of the Judean oath, we must suppose that some frivolous men, both Jews and Heathen, had then inferred from the words Ex. xx. 2–6 that an oath taken by this God did not bind the Judean taking it as regards the Heathen as the worshippers of other gods, or rather of no gods; and unfortunately, as we see from Matt. v. 33–39, xxiii. 16–22, all kinds of cavilling questions as to which oaths were obligatory had then long been current. The rest is explained by Matt. v. 43.

the dregs of this bitterest cup which the Flavians placed before them; and a higher necessity was about to urge them—if they wished to continue respected and useful in the world—to put an end to such serious practical difficulties as may be involved in even misconceptions of a national history. It is true, national ill-will in various forms had now been greatly intensified; and the growing disinclination to carefully study Heathen books [1] was very unfavourable to the historical inquiries which the case absolutely demanded. Josephus had, it is true, completely thrown off many of the strongest prejudices of the Judeans, and was, therefore, in a better position to undertake the work required: he lived, moreover, in Rome in the full current of the learning of the time, and with ample leisure to use it, while the nature of his mind appeared to have fitted him rather for curious research and artistic narrative than for melancholy brooding and resentment. In fact, the requirement of the time in this direction appealed to him as a serious exhortation: the longer he lived in Rome quietly the more his consciousness of being equal to the work strengthened, and at length he prepared himself for historical inquiries and composition much more fully than Philo had ever done. We must, therefore, endeavour to form a definite idea of Josephus in this aspect.

In many respects he had great similarity to Jeremiah, as the noblest survivor of the first destruction of Jerusalem. As that prophet before the destruction of the city withdrew from the dominant parties in it, and was in consequence bitterly hated by them, so also did Josephus; and as after the city had been taken the favour of the conqueror was offered to the prophet, so was it to Josephus also. But the difference between the two men is far greater; and in this how plainly can we discern the decisive and complete ruin of the ancient nation! Whilst Jeremiah, amid all his severe and protracted sufferings, never really betrayed his country nor flattered the conqueror, but even after the destruction preferred to share its greatest calamities, and to continue even then, in spite of misconceptions and ingratitude, constantly a faithful prophet,[2] Josephus was too much a man of the world not to despair, after the first great trying calamity, of purity in action, and not to prefer the rest of time to that of eternity. Whilst the last of the greatest prophets of Israel felt that truest and deepest sorrow on the overthrow of his country which none can feel more truly

[1] See *ante*, p. 44.

[2] See vol. iv. pp. 249 sq.

than the whole nation itself, even in the midst of its dumb silence, and indeed in its errors, Josephus, though in his books he expresses many complaints at the recent bitter fortunes of his country, endeavoured to alleviate the national calamity in a very characteristic way. Jeremiah's writings consequently contributed most powerfully once more to call forth, as from the grave, a rejuvenated and vigorous Israel; and his sorrow over the ruins of Jerusalem was regarded subsequently by the whole nation as so infinitely true and profound that the beautiful little Book of Lamentations over those ruins, although he was not its author,[1] was ascribed to him; whilst every one of the numerous and long works of Josephus was written practically in vain, so far as his own nation went, and he failed to attain by them his immediate purpose as regards the world generally of his day.

We do not on this account deny the great and honest pains which he bestowed on his works within the limitations which had from the first been drawn for an author of his class, nor the use which they soon served, and still serve, particularly in regard to matters which he had least of all in his thoughts when he was writing. He was not a Hellenist by birth like Philo; and though he made some acquaintance with foreign languages in Rome itself before the war, he was obliged, when he proposed to write Greek books in rivalry with the Greeks themselves, to make use of the assistance of those who were masters of the tongue.[2] From that time, it is true, he took less pains than previously to obtain an accurate knowledge of Hebrew, and in his writings exhibits great weakness in this tongue. It cost him still more labour to make himself acquainted with Greek literature in its wide extent as far as he needed this for his inquiries; and in this department he accomplished much. And though his love of historical truth, of which he boasts in comparison with Greek historians of his day,[3] exhibited the limitations of the Pharisaic school, it was not to be despised as compared with that of most contemporary authors.[4] From being a Pharisee with a good deal of narrow-

[1] See vol. v. pp. 17 sq.

[2] *Contra Ap.* i. 9, χρησάμενος τισὶ πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοῖς: comp. *Ant.* prœm. 2, lib. xx. 11. 2. It was shown vol. v. p. 484 that the *Book concerning the Maccabees*, mentioned *ante*, p. 61, may not be ascribed to him, though it belongs to his time.

[3] Particularly *Bell. Jud.* proem. 5–12; but in other passages he boasts frequently when opportunity offers of his love of truth, e.g. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 11. 5; *Ant.* proem. 1, lib. xx. 8. 3, 11. 2; *Contra Ap.* i. 9, 10; and *Vita*, cap. 65 sq.; and elsewhere when occasion offers.

[4] In general nothing further than this can be said; throughout this work we have had to speak of his love of truth in details.

ness he became a very distinguished Hellenist, who excelled Philo, as the most important Hellenist author previous to himself—at all events, in respect of extensive historical knowledge; and this is probably the best that can be said with regard to Josephus the Roman. He appropriated generally all the Greek learning and philosophy of his time,[1] and adorned with its flowers his Greek style, which was of itself polished enough. He had less need to occupy himself with Latin,[2] as the educated Romans themselves at that time, and still more far into the second century A.D., were almost more familiar with the Greek than with their own mother tongue.

He first undertook the work *Concerning the Jewish War* in seven books, and finished it probably in the midst of Vespasian's reign. As he tells us in the preface, and often elsewhere, the idea was suggested to him by the number of exceedingly untrustworthy accounts of the war which were drawn up and circulated by Heathen of all kinds immediately after its close.[3] He had reason to believe that he was himself in various respects better qualified to give an account of the war,[4] and composed it first in the Hebrew language for his own countrymen, and not until afterwards in Greek. The Hebrew edition, although he circulated it in the East, has not been preserved, evidently because it was not popular with his own countrymen of the East. When he subsequently came to be on a more friendly footing with Titus than with Vespasian, the former gave him the Imperial memoirs on the war to read, and then approved of his work when he presented it to the two Cæsars, sanctioning it by his official signature as the best and only account worth reading.[5] But he laid the separate books as they

[1] Thus he maintains, like Philo, that God is in his nature unknown, and like his predecessor he distinguishes with the Greek philosophers four principal virtues, *Contra Ap.* ii. 16; he sanctions also the principle of *allegorising* the Scriptures, *Ant.* præm. 4.

[2] But he understood Latin, and on one occasion appeals to Livy, in connection with the history of Pompey, *Ant.* xiv. 4. 3.

[3] To these belonged the work of *Antoninus* (or *Julianus Antonius*), mentioned by Minucius Felix, xxxiii. 4, who was appointed governor of Judea shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, see vol. vii. p. 574, and deemed himself, as having seen the war close at hand, qualified to give an account of it. The account, to judge from Minucius, was of a very hostile character. The Roman of this name, often mentioned in the *Noctes Atticæ* of Gellius, was probably quite another person.

[4] He particularly boasts, *Contra Ap.* i. 8 *ad fin.*, 9, 10, of having committed many things to writing during the war.

[5] *Vita*, § 65: the Καῖσαρ whose ὑπομνήματα he had read, is probably intended to be Vespasian, as they are mentioned in *Vita*, § 65, but they were probably combined with those of Titus, as other writers subsequently boasted of having read 'the memoirs of the Emperors,' *Contra Ap.* i. 10. These Imperial memoirs had not then been published; and a passage which Josephus probably took from them was referred to vol. vii. p. 553.

were written before King Agrippa also,[1] exchanged sixty-two letters with him upon the work, and received the king's corrections. Many other Judeans and Romans of position expressed to him their approval.[2] One of the chief objects of his work was, however, to spread a more just opinion of the Judeans and their faith amongst the Heathen generally, that by this means the great contempt under which his nation then suffered might be gradually removed. This is his own assertion,[3] and we have every reason to trust him in this respect. And as this zeal to procure perhaps some advantage amongst Romans of position to his nation, which was then so much distressed and despised, happily coincided with the good qualifications of the author and even the novelty of his undertaking, a very excellent work, in spite of all its defects, was produced, which remained by far the best of the author's two larger works, as we have already seen.[4]

When he took in hand this work he did not propose to write the general history of his nation, as 'many Judeans had before him carefully written the history of their ancestors in their own language, and some Greeks had also translated fairly well their books.'[5] He introduced his narrative of the war, therefore, with simply a brief summary of the previous history since the rising of the Maccabees. But the approbation with which this work was at once received, at all events in Europe, and especially the patronage of a man of reputation in Rome at the time, named Epaphroditus,[6] who desired to be informed fully regarding the general history of the nation, induced him to carry out the idea, which had entered his mind as he was engaged on his first work,[7] of writing an extensive

[1] *Ante*, pp. 18 sq.

[2] *Contra Ap.* i. 9, 10; *Vita*, § 65, where he gives two of Agrippa's notes.

[3] *Bell. Jud.* proem. §§ 3, 4.

[4] Vol. vii. pp. 492 sq.

[5] *Bell. Jud.* proem. 6. It is much to be desired that he had named the Judean authors to whom he refers; for we know from what we have seen *ante*, p. 62, what Greeks he means. He distinguishes the former expressly from the *prophets*, and means therefore later writers.

[6] From his name he was not a Roman, but probably a Greek freedman; and as a man of this description with this name was in the court of Nero, and afterwards became very powerful at Domitian's court, and as Josephus must have desired to be on good terms with the powerful courtiers of the Flavians, it is very natural to suppose that this Epaphroditus is the man intended; and the eulogy which Josephus passes upon him, *Ant.* proem. 2, *Contra Ap.* ii. 41, would suit him well; moreover, we know no other Epaphroditus of eminence belonging to this period. But Josephus's *Life*, in which the *Antiquities* are for the first time fully dedicated to him (quite at the end), was not written until long after Domitian's death, whilst this Epaphroditus was banished by that emperor the year before the latter's murder, and then condemned to death (Suet. *Nero*, cap. 49, *Dom.* cap. 14; Cassius Dio, *Hist.* lxvii. 14). Still, it is possible that as he had already been banished he was not at once really executed, and so survived Domitian's fall; at all events Suetonius speaks simply of a *condemnatio*.

[7] *Ant.* proem. 2, comp. *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 7 *ad fin.*

work on the history generally of his nation. In this work more than in the previous one he attempted to rival the principal Greek historians, arranged it entirely after the model of one of their larger histories, and called it, after their example, *Twenty Books of Judean Archæology*, as he proposed especially to describe in it the origin and the earlier history of his nation with reference to its ancient laws and customs, though at the same time he continued the narrative with great fulness down to the beginning of the last great war in the year 66 A.D. In this work also it was Josephus's chief object to disperse Heathen prejudices against his nation as it exhibited itself in history and still continued to live in adherence to its ancient laws: a subsidiary purpose was to render the subject-matter of the Jewish sacred Scriptures more intelligible to the Heathen. We have already seen,[1] however, how inadequate this work was as regards the earlier history, and accordingly how defective it was as regards the most difficult and important general history of the nation. It is as if a veil were everywhere over the eyes of the historian, hindering him from seeing the true greatness of his own people as it appeared in its most vigorous and noble period; and even the pains he often takes to prove that greatness, or at all events to defend the ancient nation against modern aspersions, produce little effect. It is not until he approaches more recent history, with which he is more familiar and in greater sympathy, that his work acquires more life and attractiveness, and for us greater value; but it is just in these periods that he fails to perceive the great errors to which his people was more and more resigning itself. We must, therefore, now be chiefly grateful to him for the accounts from lost books which he introduced in various parts of the earlier history likewise.

As Josephus was compelled, in order to write this great work, to procure a large amount of fresh information, and to collect and examine many books that had till then been less familiar to him, it is not surprising that it was not before the thirteenth year of Domitian (93-94 A.D.) that he finished it, as he himself states at the end. He was then fifty-six years of age,[2] but by no means thought of laying aside for the future his facile pen; and he was at the time so much occupied

[1] Vol. i. p. 200.

[2] If we compare the numerous notes of time at the end of the *Antiquities* with those in *Vita*, § 1, it follows that he may have published the *Antiquities* in the year 93 A.D., which it is important to observe as bearing on his subsequent works. He was born in the first year of Caligula, 37 A.D.

with two fresh literary undertakings that he announced them at the conclusion of his *Antiquities*. On the one hand, he had learnt beyond doubt that his first book on the War had met with a good many serious objections, which he was bound to attend to; and, on the other, his position and conduct in Rome had aroused repeatedly the open displeasure of many. For after the death of Titus his Judean enemies at the court of Domitian supposed they might express themselves more freely against him: they had gone so far as to lay accusations against him, and had incited even the Heathen eunuch, the tutor of his children, whom he had received into his house after the manner of wealthy Romans, to lay similar charges, though Domitian had ordered them all to be executed as false accusers.[1] As all this was then remembered as of recent occurrence, he considered himself bound to make a public defence, and accordingly promised a supplement to his *Antiquities*, in which he would relate his own life and touch further on many points of the history of the War. The *Antiquities* itself was published without this supplement, and he thought he should be able to supply it within a year.[2]

But before he could finish even the first of the two new works announced, he had to learn how unfavourably his *Antiquities* had been received by many Heathen of great repute, and how far the work was from being regarded as a satisfactory refutation of the prejudices raised by Heathen authors regarding the early history of his people. This was evidently very painful to him, and he felt deeply the ridicule and contempt which he saw was still poured upon his nation and its sacred laws after the destruction of the Temple. He resolved accordingly quickly to publish first of all a small work of an entirely different kind. This work is the *Two Books on the great Antiquity of the Judeans*, or, as they were subsequently called, *Against Apion*, which is, in proportion to its size, not only to us the most useful, but for all times the best book that ever came from his pen. If he had wished to give this book a heading which would describe its contents and purpose truly, he must have called it an *Apology for the Judeans*, for this it is in reality, and pretty much in the sense in which so many distinguished Christians soon afterwards published before the eyes of Heathen rulers apologies for Christianity. But it seems as if the timidly cautious man feared to avow openly in the heading of his work

[1] All this he relates subsequently, *Vita*, § 76, but very briefly, because he did not then suppose that a more lengthy account could be of advantage to himself.

[2] This is the meaning of the expression κατὰ περιδρομήν, in the whole context, at the end of the *Antiquities*.

the design of defending his people before the eyes of a Flavian emperor, and preferred a less striking heading, with a corresponding arrangement, for his work. He begins accordingly with the complaint that so many Greeks continue to represent the Judeans as only a very recent nation, which had depended on other nations for instruction, and possessed no primitive force and originality; and, in refuting these calumnies, he defends his nation at the same time against the aspersion of having had a very disgusting origin even,[1] as well as against other charges and insults alleged by Apion especially.[2] Having at the end of this first part of his defence in turn bitterly attacked the whole character and pretensions of Apion, and paid him back in his own coin, he makes an easy transition, in view of so many calumnies, to an eloquent defence of Moses and his Laws;[3] and, indeed, to charges against the Heathen theology and legislation,[4] under which name he cautiously describes, not the Roman, but primarily only the Greek religious system; and then concludes with more general observations.[5] The entire work is animated by a warm love of the subject, and the reader is thereby pleasingly affected, particularly when the defence of the sacred Law is immediately concerned; and in his attacks he observes moderation, in the case of Apion only allowing himself greater liberties. Josephus has in this work most admirably brought together all that he could say in defence of his people and the sacred Law; and the example which he thus set was such that it soon encouraged Christians to undertake a similar work for Christianity, only in a still better style. Josephus wrote this work while he was enjoying the sunshine of his good fortune in Rome; that is, during the reign of Domitian,[6] probably in the next year after the publication of his *Antiquities*.

But while he was deferring the writing of his *Life*, and only temporarily, as it were, introduced into these books against Apion a few words incidentally in defence of his first work,[7] Domitian was overtaken by his sudden downfall, in the year

[1] i. 1–8, 11–35. In the whole of this first book he says nothing at all against Apion, not even mentioning him; and if we may judge from the opening of the second book (though both are dedicated to Epaphroditus), he seems in the first instance to have published the first book by itself and without the heading *Against Apion*.

[2] ii. 1–13.

[3] ii. 14–32.

[4] ii. 33–35.

[5] ii. 36–41.

[6] For it does not appear in the book itself that Domitian had then been overthrown; and from the tone of the words i. 9, Agrippa was still living, which is quite different from what we find in the next work. If the book was published in the year 94 A.D. the Epaphroditus to whom it is dedicated might very well be still at the court of Domitian.

[7] *Contra Ap.* i. 8 *ad fin.*, 9, 10: if the *Life* had been written first, this precursor of it, as Josephus himself calls it, would have been superfluous.

96 A.D., and Agrippa died soon afterwards, in the year 101 A.D. This double calamity was destined to affect our historian most disastrously: he had now no powerful patron left, and all his enemies could exert themselves more unrestrainedly. In these circumstances, Justus of Tiberias, with whom he had come into collision as a general in Galilee,[1] and who had all along remained less Roman in feeling than himself, made himself heard of in an entirely new way. He wrote a book called *The Crown of the Judean Kings*,[2] in which he began with Moses and closed with the last seven Judean kings after Herod, the monarch of his own country, Agrippa, being really the seventh and last of the final royal line. This work was rather ornate and studiedly brief than true and useful, and contained severe attacks upon Josephus both as an historian and a man. Thus forced by it, Josephus, much against his will, could delay no longer the publication of his *Autobiography*, in connection evidently with the new edition of his *Antiquities*, to which it was appended.[3] This short work contains much that is historically instructive, though in its violent language with regard to Justus[4] it shows only too plainly what implacable enmities still prevailed in the minds of aged Judeans of this class, and that Josephus had in his old age quite lost all true balance and equanimity. The spectacle which such men presented was the more offensive, as they really contended simply about their own personal shortcomings, and not about anything of a really elevated character. The other book which Josephus had promised at the end of his *Antiquities* was intended to treat 'of God and His nature, and of the Laws, and why according to them some things are allowed and others prohibited.'[5] But he was probably subsequently prevented

[1] See vol. vii. pp. 534, 541.

[2] According to Photius, who hi self read the book and described it briefly in his *Bibliotheca*, codex 33, it had the heading *βασιλεῖς Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ ἐν τοῖς στέμμασι*; but more probably, according to Diog. Laert. ii. 5, 20, *Στέμμα* or *στέμματα* (*τῶν β.* Ἰ.); and the work *On the Jewish War*, in Steph. Byz. *s.v.* *Τιβεριάς* is undoubtedly the same. It appears both from the indications in Josephus, *Vita*, § 65, and Photius that it was not written until after Agrippa's death.

[3] As appears plainly from the closing sentences of the *Life* compared with those of the *Antiquities*; and the *Life* also begins *Ἐμοὶ δὲ γένος*, referring thus to what had preceded.

[4] § 65, where Josephus stoops to a long, direct address to his opponent.

[5] It is undoubtedly to this work that he refers not unfrequently elsewhere, although he does not always definitely indicate its title, e.g. *Ant.* proem. § 4; i. 1. 1, 10. 5; iii. 6. 6, 8. 10; iv. 8. 4; *Contra Ap.* i. 14 *ad fin.* According to this reference the work would have contained various allegories, and we might at most be simply curious to know how his essays in this department would have differed from Philo's. Other expressions, such as occur *Vita*, § 11 (comp. *ἔφαμεν*, § 12), in which Josephus refers to something that he had written which is not now to be found in his works, simply show, as we might on other grounds infer from other indications, that his works have not come down to us in a perfectly unmutilated condition: as was observed vol. vi. p. 139, they early found their way to classes of

from publishing this work; and the loss is the less serious, as we can infer from his other books how he would have treated this question.

We have thus reviewed the historical literature of the Judeans of this period, and we can readily perceive that it necessarily failed of its immediate purpose. As it had no proper understanding of the true greatness and elevation of the national history of two thousand years, so neither could it perceive the real defects and serious vices which had become more and more deeply rooted during the last six centuries of national decline. It was, moreover, little adapted to meet the wants of the surviving members of the nation, and, as a fact, produced no effect at all in their case. As it was, on the contrary, wholly without the animating influence of the true spirit of the ancient true religion, and had already become a mere imitation of Greek and Roman historical literature, so it really aimed simply at informing the Heathen, and especially the powerful and ruling persons amongst them, with regard to the ancient people of God and its sacred things. But the result soon showed how far it was from attaining that aim amongst the Heathen. Even the Heathen historians—who from this time turn their attention somewhat more to Judean history—such as Tacitus, who wrote soon after Josephus, Justinus, or Plutarch,[1] borrowed some historical particulars from books of this class,[2] but did not take the trouble to enter into the genuine Judean view of things, and continued to follow the most foolish and baseless notions with regard to the early history of the people, as they had been started by previous Heathen historians.

3. *Public Events under the Flavian Dynasty.*

This effort of the historians, therefore, like all others, failed to fill up the wide chasm which had long been formed between slowly conquered Judeanism and Heathenism, and which at the time before us yawned more widely than ever. Whilst the Romans took no pains to reconcile the remnants of the ancient

readers for whom they were not originally designed.

[1] Who incidentally, at all events, touches on various Judean matters in his numerous writings. But Herennius Philo of Byblus, who flourished in the reign of Hadrian, can hardly have written a book Concerning the Judeans; in Origen, *Contra Cels.* i. 15, he is probably confounded with the other Philo above mentioned (*ante*, p. 62), who may likewise be meant in Clem. *Strom.* i. 21 (p. 337, ed. Sylb.); and in the Sanchuniathonian extracts (Euseb. *Præp. Evan.* i. 10, p. 42, ed. Or.) περὶ Ἰουδαίων is so completely discordant with the context that the words are probably only a mistake for Φοινίκων; comp. my *Abhandlung über Sanchuniathon*, 15, 53, 57.

[2] Thus Tacitus used Josephus's work on the Jewish War, as was remarked vol. vii. p. 494, and may easily be shown more at length.

nation, venerable (as Josephus not without reason maintained) on account of its antiquity, to their mournful fate, or to pay any close attention to their Law, or to promote as far as might be possible their well-being, none of the efforts of the nation's own new teachers, prophets, or historians succeeded in setting on foot any genuine mutual understanding or salutary co-operation. The Romans occupied too lofty a position, and on that very account disdained to go on persecuting with any special animosity and with greater severity, or to trouble themselves much about the apparently wretched remnant of the nation which had just defied their Imperial power. The majority of the Judeans were for the moment content, perhaps, with this form of disdain, but on both sides the implacability was equal, although the sharp points and edges of the differences which divided them were felt much more painfully by the one than by the other.

But it soon appeared that this depth of misery did not make the Judeans more inclined to go over to Heathenism: though many proselytes now wavered and apostatised,[1] the main body of the remaining ancient Community exhibited all the less desire to lose itself in Heathenism, and in such a way to become amalgamated with the rest of the world. It was still apparent that the true religion, even in the midst of its own dark eclipse, could not relapse wholly into Heathenism; and there was thereby supplied, amid all the disastrous defeats and humiliations of this period, once more some possibility of a new rising and restoration of energy. And as during these decades the damped courage and spirit of the ancient nation and of the religion which it had made its own gradually revived again, with the hope of once more ruling in the world, as we have seen, the inflammable materials of conflict and hatred which had previously caught fire between Judeans and Romans were thereby again accumulated, so that it was rather an accident than anything else if they did not immediately burst into flame again. The new prophecy fed most dangerously the fires of new and proud expectations; the new teaching, notwithstanding all its calmness and forced moderation, nourished the embers of the old attractive claims; and even such time-serving men as Josephus, though they paid homage to the government of the day, and appeared to find satisfaction only in the memory of past national greatness, or in the observance of a few apparently

[1] As we may naturally suppose, and as we find only too unmistakably expressed, almost against his will, in brief terms by Josephus, *Contra Ap.* ii. 10. This is complained of also 2 Bar.

ancient, written regulations of conduct, and in the future hopes sustained by the persistent faithfulness of their people to the Law,[1] might in other circumstances easily be carried away by the enthusiasm of another successful national rising. This fire, which had shortly before blazed up so luridly in view of the whole world, might now smoulder in secret, but it only waited for a favourable moment to break out again, and, if possible, more openly and destructively than ever. But during the reign of the Flavians there was not the slightest prospect of such a moment: they had reached the throne of the empire partly by their difficult victory over this fire, and found a guarantee for the continuance of their rule in the persistent employment of all the severe measures which they had used to effectually keep it under—measures which were not at all revoked by their exceptional favour towards such men as Josephus and the Herods. The subjugated Judeans, too, were profoundly conscious that they had nothing to expect from fresh violent revolts and risings as long as the new dynasty held the reins of power. Vespasian had in the first years of his reign everywhere in the wide Roman empire trampled down too mercilessly[2] the last sparks of defiant resistance, and even of mere contradiction and complaint. It was too clear that the first two Flavians had favoured and tolerated near their court only such Judeans as Josephus; and Domitian continued to reply by sentences of death to any complaint against the historian, as we have seen.[3]

Of public Judean events under the Flavians we have, therefore, but little to say. This silence of history is itself very significant; and a widely circulated prophetic book of the time had, as we have seen,[4] plainly enough directed all expectant hearts to the overthrow of Domitian as the great dividing line between the mournful present and the Messianic glory.

It is only too probable that the Zealots of the Law, as the implacable enemies of the Romans, could not be completely eradicated by even the most cruel punishments, and sought all along opportunities of wreaking their indignation on everything that was Roman, and particularly everything Imperial; and this probability is confirmed especially by one remarkable instance in the account of a contemporary. In the sunny valleys of Jericho were still to be found the rich fields of balsam shrubs,

[1] For the obstinacy of the Judeans condemned to fight with wild beasts (see vol. vii. p. 609), and their steadfast refusal, even amid the horrors of death, to violate the Law, made a deep impression upon Josephus even, *Contra Ap.* i. 8.

[2] See vol. vii. pp. 612 sq.

[3] *Ante*, p. 72.

[4] *Ante*, p. 52 sq.

which, as was generally believed, yielded a large revenue, and constituted one of the most enviable sources of the wealth of Palestine. These fields were considered to have been planted by Solomon,[1] and at this late period they were still reckoned amongst the royal domains. The Herods had cultivated them as well as other fields of valuable plants in the southern plain of the Jordan at Archelais, Phasaelis, and Livias, more carefully, if possible, than the earlier rulers, and had obtained rich treasures from them. The Cæsars had then become the heirs of the Herods in this respect; and during the great war these shrubs had been spared undoubtedly on account of their great value as sources of revenue. But now Vespasian, like Pompey formerly, had in his triumph at Rome presented amongst other objects a balsam shrub to the gaze of the Roman citizens. This was probably sufficient to provoke an outbreak of the indignation of many Zealots still left in Palestine; and it was soon related in the empire that as the mad Judeans were infuriated against their own bodies, so now they had vented their blind revenge on the balsam plantations, so that in this instance again only the Roman sword could restore order.[2]

There was one thing particularly which was calculated to arouse the indignation of even the most patient—the payment of the sacred Temple tax to the Capitoline Jupiter, which Vespasian had commanded.[3] If the Roman census had supplied the first occasion formerly of all risings against the Romans,[4] this transformation of the sacred Temple tax into a tax to Jupiter appeared now exactly like a perpetual insult added to all the other humiliations. To be taxed in this way for the god of the Romans was a requirement laid upon this nation alone, while, from the nature of its religion, it ought to have been least of all imposed upon it;[5] and this was, moreover, the more oppressive as the Hagiocracy, in the form in which it was now perpetuated, likewise insisted on the payment of all the former sacred taxes.[6] It was natural that some Judeans

[1] See vol. iii. p. 281.

[2] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xii. 54, comp. xiii. 9, and Justin. *Hist.* xxxvi. 3. 1–5, where § 2 probably *Hiericus*, i.e. Jericho, should be read instead of *arcus*; comp. vol. vi. p. 75. It is true Pliny does not say in what year these devastations took place; but the whole context of the narrative, and particularly the addition *sæviere in eam Judæi sicut in vitam quoque suam*, points to the time immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem when so many committed suicide. These *Idumææ palmæ* are also alluded to Mart. *Epigr.* x. 50. 1, comp. ii. 2. 5.

[3] Vol. vii. p. 613.

[4] Vol. vi. p. 45.

[5] This reason is at all events suggested Appian *Syr.* cap. 50, comp. Mart. *Epigr.* vii. 55. 7, 8.

[6] See *ante*, p. 44.

should seek to escape payment by whatever means possible; but Domitian, with his well-known love of money and cruelty, caused the most disgraceful measures to be taken to get hold of every possible delinquent, and extended the tax, contrary to its original intention, so as to include old people.[1]

We can easily understand that the Flavians always kept a sharp eye upon the slightest movements that threatened to break out amongst the Judeans; and at that time disturbances were always being expected from the Parthian and Syrian East. As the Flavians had early had their attention directed by Josephus and others to the Messianic hopes cherished in Israel,[2] so subsequently they continued to be sensitive with regard to them; and after the year 68 the Judeans were undoubtedly for a long time not a little agitated by the reports, connected with those hopes, that Nero was still alive and would come from the East for the destruction of Rome, to the terror of the Christians and the Flavians, but as formerly (especially for Poppæa's sake[3]) most favourably disposed towards the Judeans.[4] It will be mentioned below that the suspicious Domitian dreaded even the harmless relatives of Christ until he had palpably convinced himself that they were not dangerous. From the same source from which we learn this we are told also that soon after the destruction of Jerusalem Vespasian made careful search for the descendants of David, and that this caused much trouble to the Judeans.[5] This brief reminiscence can hardly have had no foundation; and the circumstance that the Roman authors say nothing about it is natural enough if no important result was brought to light by the search.

We have already observed[6] that after Vespasian's death many Judeans breathed more freely, and that just then the power of bold prophecy once more revived. But it had soon to be seen that there was nothing to be hoped for with regard to the freedom of the Judeans under a Flavian; and the heavy

[1] Suet. *Dom.* cap. 12, comp. *ante*, p. 27. Tertullian in his day complains that Christians were subjected to a disgraceful tax, *De Fugâ*, cap. xiii.

[2] See vol. vii. p. 547.

[3] See vol. vii. p. 408.

[4] The first book that spoke of this, if not openly yet plainly enough to the intelligent, was probably the Apocalypse; the belief then played an important part in the Sibylline books (see my *Abhandlung* thereon, pp. 55, 89) as well as in the *Ascension of Isaiah*, iv. 2; comp. Suet. *Nero*, capp. 40, 57; Tac. *Hist.* i. 2, ii. 8, 9; Cassius Dio, lxiv. 9, with the notes of Reimarus. It was, however, manifestly only Christians amongst whom this idea of a return of Nero was very long entertained (comp. in the first half of the third century the poem of Commodian's in Pitra's *Spicil. Solesm.* i. p. 43); and it appears from Sulpicii Severi *Hist. Sacra* ii. 29, that the Apocalypse had most influence in keeping it alive.

[5] Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 12. The narratives capp. 11, 12, are quoted simply as *tradition*; but so are the similar ones capp. 18–20, and yet Hegesippus is in this case quoted at last as the authority.

[6] *Ante*, p. 46.

hand of Domitian was felt quite otherwise than Nero's, which had previously provoked the complaints and indignation of the Judeans. We shall see below what changes occurred after the overthrow of the Flavian house in the year 96.

Later Judean accounts preserve, further, various reminiscences of journeys to Italy and Rome, which the Gamaliel who was then at the head of the Judean teachers in Palestine [1] is said to have made with some of the most famous of the other Rabbis of the time.[2] It is involved almost in the nature of the case that these journeys to the court of the Cæsars had to do with petitions for the favour of the emperors and with representations with regard to certain oppressive burdens; in these late reminiscences the real purpose of them is no longer clearly to be recognised, but they are concerned with views with regard to the interpretation of certain Mosaic laws which could be of moment to Rabbis alone. Yet, at the same time, we find in them a story of a Roman senator who, having become a convert to Judeanism, communicated to the Judeans the unfavourable resolutions with regard to their countrymen which had been passed in the senate, and who then committed suicide because he could not carry his dissentient view. We might conjecture [3] that in this tradition, which is quite unintelligible as reported, the execution of Flavius Clemens is meant, who, though a near kinsman of Domitian, was put to death by him the last year but one of his reign on the charge of 'atheism,' as some related, that is, because he was inclined to adopt Christian customs, and thereby renounce the Roman gods.[4] If this Clemens had really been inclined towards pure Judeanism, the implacable displeasure of a Flavian emperor against him would certainly have been quite intelligible; but we shall see subsequently that this story must receive quite another interpretation, and is connected with the history of the spread of Christianity in Rome. It is true, Christianity still continued to be often confounded with Judeanism by the leading Heathen, and it was regarded all along by the Rabbis as simply a schism in Judeanism itself. For that reason the question might be raised whether the report of the bitter

[1] See *ante*, p. 34.

[2] *M.* Ma'aser sheni v. 9; Erûbin, iv. 1, 2. The place פרנדיסים on the sea, which is mentioned Erûbin iv. 1, must undoubtedly be read as *Prindisim*, a natural form of Brundusium, after the modern form *Brindisi*, which may then have been current amongst the people; but in that case the name of itself points to a journey to Rome.

[3] As has been done publicly in our day.

[4] The only Heathen author that gives this as the crime with which Clemens was charged is Cassius Dio, lxvii. 14; Suet. *Dom.* cap. 15 gives another account; see below.

[Probably the author purposely substituted *Christian* for '*Jewish* customs,' as Cassius Dio writes.—Tr.]

sufferings which some relatives of the house of Vespasian had then (as we shall see below) to endure on account of the Christian faith may not have been perhaps the ultimate occasion of the above Judean tradition. We have no means of getting further knowledge with regard to it.

The Condition of the Samaritans.

But before we go on to describe the last stage of the history of the Judeans, as the greater and more important portion of the ancient nation of Israel, we may suitably take at this point a backward glance at the fortunes of the Samaritans, who, although less widely spread, still exhibited a rare degree of mental activity, and became once more involved also in the subsequent general history of Israel. We saw above,[1] that although they maintained a greater and worthier degree of mental independence than the Judeans, forming thereby a justifiable contrast to them, from the very first they had as their basis too little independent knowledge and clearness of purpose to actually obtain a spiritual supremacy over the Judeans. A consequence of this spurious position was growing trouble and unhappiness in the mutual relations of the two great Communities into which ancient Israel had been spiritually divided. Neither as regards political influence and independence had the Samaritans for a long time been able to compete with the Judeans; and however jealous they were of their advantages, they suffered constantly from the more powerful influence of the learned Judean schools in Jerusalem and elsewhere. The differences as regards doctrines, customs, and views which had thus grown up between the two Communities in the course of centuries were based to some extent, it is true, upon motives derived from truer knowledge, according as its rays were more abundant and their force greater on one or the other side; but they proceeded far more from the darkness of mutual jealousy and the turbid sources of a growing animosity which could not be effectually removed. And yet the whole of these differences were all along too petty to attract much attention from the rulers of the world, so that the Samaritans were generally classed by the Romans with the Judeans as the Circumcised, and were compelled to observe essentially the same Imperial laws. When any decree proceeded from the Imperial government, to which both Communities were subject, whereby the Samaritans felt themselves injured, or if suddenly a higher en-

[1] Vol. v.

thusiasm burst into flame amongst the Judeans for a cause which apparently concerned collected Israel, the Samaritans might be led, in conjunction with the Judeans, to take part in risings which seemed to promise the restoration of ancient Israel as a whole, one instance of which met us in the last war,[1] and another will occur in the war soon to be expected. But as the Samaritans possessed generally less deeply rooted spiritual independence and vigour, and were fewer in point of numbers, they were usually sooner exhausted, and withdrew from the struggle, seeking the best conditions they could get for themselves from the Imperial power. The consequence of which was, that the hereditary animosity between the two kindred Communities grew perpetually more intense, until at last the final Divine judgment necessarily broke over them, and they were both completely destroyed so far as they could claim any national position in the world.

So now, also, after the first attempted resistance of the Samaritans to Vespasian had been disastrously put down,[2] they seemed to have obtained, by increased subserviency, the Roman favour even before the end of the reign of the Zealots in Jerusalem. It is true, details with regard to this are wanting, but we may confidently infer it from the revived prosperity of the Samaritan district and the Samaritan people which may be observed in these decades. An unusually vigorous mental life must have been developed amongst them at this period, whilst the Judeans were long suffering under the heavy calamities that had befallen them; and the province had also flourished so much that in the next great war it could become the principal scene of the most obstinate struggles. Vespasian, moreover, evidently bestowed great pains upon the restoration of this centre of Palestine after its devastation in the great war. He not only restored Cæsarea on the Sea, which became now a purely Heathen city,[3] under the new name of *Colonia prima Flavia*, but built also a new magnificent city, which boasted of the name Flavia Neapolis Neokoros (as guardian of the Temple), and which from this time became, under the short name of Neapolis (now Nâbulus), the great capital of the whole of central Palestine.[4] It was not so very far north of Jerusalem,

[1] Vol. vii. p. 547.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 547.
[3] See *ibid.* p. 505.
[4] This may be inferred especially from Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* v. 14, comp. Jos. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 8. 1; both call the city simply Neapolis, but its full name is given on the coins, see Eckhel's *Doctr. Num.* iii. pp. 433 sq. On the other hand, the name *Diocæsarea* for Sepphoris in Galilee, often mentioned vol. vii., like *Diospolis* for Lydda, near Jerusalem, does not appear to have originated before the war of Barkokheba, as Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* v. 15, still uses the simple name Lydda.

and its site, on that of the ancient village Mabortha,[1] was close by the ancient Sichem, in the neighbourhood of which stood the great Samaritan sanctuary. It was from the very first inhabited by many Heathen also; the Christian philosopher Justin, the son of Priscus (whom we shall so often meet), for instance, having been born and educated in it: still it remained chiefly a Samaritan town.

In such circumstances the profound alienation of the Judeans and the Samaritans (who were called by the former simply *Cutheans*)[2] from each other became now more decided than ever; so much so that the behaviour of the former towards the latter became a matter requiring the legislative interference of the Rabbis. And as this alienation reappeared after the great final war now pending, a very circumstantial judicial dissertation '*concerning the Cutheans*' was drawn up for the body of Jewish Law,[3] which prescribes most particularly the conduct of the Judeans towards this 'semi-Heathen' people in buying and selling and all other relations of life. After some historical references to the past, this dissertation closes with the sentence, that 'not until the Cutheans renounced the mountain Gerizim, blessed Israel, and believed in the resurrection of the dead, could any fellowship exist between them and Israel.' That amounted to a hopeless perpetuation of the enmity; and that they did not believe in the resurrection of the dead was really only a transient error, which had remained amongst them from the previous connection of the Sadduceans and Samaritans. In order to perceive what a mighty spiritual agitation was originating amongst the Samaritans, we must at this point glance backwards somewhat, and in the first instance look at

Simon Magus and other Samaritan Gnostics.

A community such as that of Samaria then was was quite adapted to become the soil from which the most various spiritual movements and undertakings might spring at a time when they were generally rife in the world. It was in close relation with the ancient true religion, and was always, from early jealousy, ever eagerly attentive to whatever arose in Jerusalem

[1] On this village see vol. v. p. 97, and more at length *Götts. Gel. Anz.* 1865, p. 1670.

[2] See vol. iv. pp. 215 sq.

[3] This מַסֶּכֶת כּוּתִיִּים was practically printed for the first time by Raph. Kirchheim, Frankf. 1851, pp. 31–37 in the little work, *Sieben klein. Jerusalemische Massekhet.*

likely to create a noise in the world. It was at the same time no less jealous with regard to its own greater mental freedom and receptivity; and as occupying a position midway between Judeanism and Heathenism, it suffered at the same time from the two opposite tendencies of licentious freedom and excessive scrupulosity. With the first appearance of Christianity, therefore, this soil was very much more powerfully affected than that of Judeanism. In the case of the latter, notwithstanding its rapid and growing commotions and altered forms, there was so much internal cohesion and power of resistance as enabled it to remain a united body until the destruction of Jerusalem. It is only after that event that the Community gradually falls more and more hopelessly to pieces and becomes the theatre of new movements of all kinds, so that the Rabbis have the greatest difficulty in saving what they can of it. But in the case of the Samaritan Community there was evidently from the very commencement of Christianity much more radical disruption, which only made greater progress after the destruction of Jerusalem. A number of new societies arose in Samaria both before and after this great turning-point of the general history of these times; the efforts of individual leaders to change everything often succeeded, and the most extreme attempts at universal alterations and the formation of societies such as had never been seen before were first ventured there; and the same wild ferment of all elements together which we first meet with in the larger section of the ancient Community after the destruction of the Temple[1] commenced in this smaller but freer sphere much earlier. We have not, it is true, sufficient means of following in detail the entire course of this rapid succession of new Samaritan developments as they arose in the decades before and after the destruction of the Temple. As the sphere and the duration of these new creations were very limited, the memory of them soon faded from the minds of later generations, and of the originators of many movements of this kind we now scarcely know even the names. The Samaritans, it is true, took most active part, in large numbers of books, in the great commotion of those times: the books of a certain Dositheus especially must have once made a lasting impression. But all the writings of the Samaritans themselves which would most plainly portray for us the course of this commotion, were early lost in the calamitous fate which befell the Samaritans, especially at the hands of the Byzantines

[1] See *ante*, p. 7.

and the Mohammedans; and the Samaritan annals of *Abulfatch*,[1] written 1355 A.D., contain only either wholly disconnected recollections of those times of commotion, or such as are very untrustworthy from the uncertainty of the sources through which they have come down, while they are also extremely unreliable with regard to their chronological order. But we must endeavour now to form an idea of the movements as far as we can.

All these new creations proceeded manifestly from a twofold supposition, and fall consequently into two different parties. Those who were conscious of possessing the power to undertake them might proceed from the new tendencies which this age brought with it, and by the employment of which the most daring and adventurous spirit might expect to obtain at first the largest results. And according to all that we are able now clearly to discern in this confusion, the new constructions of this kind were actually the earliest. The two most recent and most powerful tendencies of the time, however, were, on the one hand, the entire phenomenon of Christianity, and, on the other, the attractive system of Philo's philosophy; and fundamentally unlike as the two were, many a one might still be tempted to bring both into some new connection, and by means of a clever amalgamation of this kind, supported by the addition of a little personal conceit and audacity, endeavour to make a great noise in the world, and obtain for himself other advantages.

Of this class was the Samaritan *Simon*, who bears in history the surname of *Magus*, of whom we have already spoken generally.[2] When he first came into collision with the Apostles in those parts, particularly with Peter, he was evidently still young, and full of youthful ardour, as having a future before him; and afterwards he led a long and eventful life. We may plainly perceive as much as this in the reminiscences preserved. It is also obvious that his labours in general were divided between journeys into Heathen countries and founding churches in Samaria itself. After the manner of the day, he sought especially to get attention and honour in Rome; and wherever he could, but especially in his native country, he founded churches after his own spirit, the larger or smaller remnants of which might

[1] Published by Ed. Vilmar, Gotha, 1865. The most important use of this publication is simply that we now know certainly what divisions the Samaritans actually acknowledged as having once taken place amongst them; and in so far the conjectures of the first edition of this work have been fully confirmed.

[2] Vol. vii. pp. 179 sq.

be seen long after his death.[1] In later times a book of his, with the title *Great Apophasis*, or *Great Demonstration*, was in existence, in which his whole philosophy was expounded in its connection.[2] It cannot, it is true, have been written before 60–65 A.D., as it borrows figures and phrases from Christian books which had only just then been published;[3] but we have no reason to doubt that he was then still alive, and may have written this book, at least in its main outlines (for evidently some additions were made by his followers). The high-flown thoughts and the disingenuous art of his book accord with what we might expect from the other indications of his character. He takes the Old Testament as his basis, and derives all his important principles from it by the aid of allegory, helping out at times the poverty of his thought by a clandestine use of Christian books. But in reality he laboriously hammers together, after the manner of Philo, a few phrases and strings of ideas, connected by round numbers, and borrowed from Greek philosophers and poets or from other profane sources, that by such a paltry compilation he may flatter both the Heathen and the readers of the Old Testament, and finally prove that he may justly claim to be—an imitator of Christ! The cement, however, which is to connect all these elements for the purpose in view is, in addition to the cunning egotism of the man himself, simply a somewhat new conception of man when first born, just as it is still the mark of the folly of all such philosophical talkers that they base everything upon man, or rather themselves and their wisdom, and thereby flatter at the same time the evil in all men. But he was also particularly led by the desire to make his ideas attractive to the Heathen and connect them with their theology and philosophy, as the Samaritans always prided themselves on their

[1] According to the account of the nearest and best authority in this matter, the Samaritan Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 26, 56; ii. 15; Dial. c. Tryph. cap. 120.

[2] A complete summary of this book has been preserved in long verbatim extracts in Hippolytus' *Contra Hær.* vi. 7–20, comp. x. 12; some things from it have been better preserved in Iren. *Contra Hær.* i. 23. 2, 3. In the earlier authors only very few and disconnected fragments of Simon's system are given, but they still accord so essentially with the principles of the Apophasis that we cannot doubt of its genuineness. The same book with oral accounts was evidently used by the author of the Clementine Hom. ii. 22, 23, 25 30 · xviii. 11, 12; and a few other extracts from it must have been handed down to the times of Epiph. *Hær.* xxi. 2, 3, and Theodoretus, *Hær.* i. 1.

[3] We see plainly that the author knew and freely plagiarised the Gospel *Collected Sayings* (see *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* ii. pp. 196 sq. [*Die drei ersten Evang.* 2nd ed. pp. 17 sq.; *History of Israel*, vol. vi. preface p. vii]); he appeals also, vi. 14, to the text *ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν*, 1 Cor. xi. 32, without, however, naming the real author of it; but this epistle might then be in circulation. Nor need it surprise us, when we consider what has yet to be said, that Simon used other books of the Old Testament besides the Pentateuch.

greater religious freedom; and he, moreover, desired everywhere to flatter the Heathen as a means of advancing his own material welfare.

He supposes, accordingly, (1) that there are *six primary roots* of the beginning of all creation, in three pairs (syzygai)—mind and intelligence, voice and name, reason and reflection.[1] The development, on the one hand, of generative thought, as it passes gradually from the lowest and obscurest mental condition into one that is distinct and sensible, is presented in three stages, and, on the other, the force which, as it were, gives birth to it; and as Simon's entire system ultimately rests on the idea of the purely physical relation of man and woman and of their co-operation being the purely Divine relation, as will soon appear, it is not surprising that he reduces everything from the first to pairs—a mythological view which was transmitted from him to the later Gnostics. Together with these six primary roots, he supposes (2) an *infinite power* as the seventh, and therefore the highest, but at once adds that though this power exists in all six, it is in them primarily only as latent force and not as active energy; so that action itself is added as a fourth stage to the three previous ones of thought, speech, and reflection. This is apparently a very profound and essential observation, but is, in fact, only a very clever supposition, in order thereby to obtain his ultimate purpose. But that he may speak of this infinite power more after the Greek manner, he describes it, following earlier and more recent Greek philosophers, as fire in its twofold force—as either hidden or manifest—since long before an invisible celestial fire, mysteriously present throughout the whole creation, had been spoken of. In Biblical imagery it might be compared to the tree of life in Paradise. If, therefore, there is something of this fire, though in the first instance only potentially and not actively, in all visible and invisible, vocal and non-vocal, numerable and innumerable things, it follows that a perfectly rational being can only be that which can throughout those four stages think, speak, reflect, and act in infinite and infinitely various ways.[2] But there is (3) One who *stands, stood, and will stand* (*ὁ ἑστώς, στάς, στησόμενος*), i.e. in the Jewish language of the time, a true, supreme, immutable God,[3] who, though He

[1] *νοῦς* and *ἐπίνοια*, *φωνή* and *ὄνομα*, *λογισμός* and *ἐνθύμησις*: strictly the second pair should, like the first and third, have been also masculine and feminine.

[2] This must be the meaning of the passage vi. 11, which is quite unintelligible with the present text and punctuation, and must be emended as above. In the extracts from the Apophasis there are also many other serious errors.

[3] For the Rabbis discovered this threefold meaning in the ineffable name

is that infinite power, is such potentially only. It is not until He has been *imaged forth*, or represented in a corresponding sensible being, thereby becoming truly active, that He is, in nature, power, magnitude, and perfection,[1] the unbegotten, i.e. eternal, power in its activity, and falls nothing short of it. This power then further adopted *art*, becoming thus the light of things occurring; and Simon argues even that *the Spirit moving upon the waters* in the ancient account of creation must become an image, if he will not perish with the world, and that that account expressly relates that man was created 'after the image and likeness'—that is, after that twofold primary power,[2] he in whose littleness the greatest is contained. If, therefore, a man of this kind who is the active image of the infinite power actually exists, all other men, in whom the same blessed and eternal essence is present only potentially, may have their capacity for blessedness and immortality quickened by his activity, and feel it increasing from the smallest spark to an infinite extent.

We thus see how easily the idea can be perverted which follows apparently from Christ's coming—that God can influence men only through the perfect man, and that that man is the manifested God for them. Simon claimed to be the man who could by the true art arouse the latent primary power in man, and he promised to free all who believed him from their miseries; in fact, he maintained that if they believed him they were already saved through his grace, as evil was based solely on subjective opinion, and the design of the creation was simply that the men who had been freed by Simon might be delivered from their chains; indeed, it was only angels that had arbitrarily created the world, and then spoken by the prophets, that they might thereby enslave the men who listened to them. But as this vain man felt it desirable to attempt to hallow the nature of pure sense, which he really laid at the basis of all his thoughts and efforts, by means of the illusive terms of his fanciful philosophy, he pretended that as, according to the above notion of pairs, a female *intelligence* belonged of necessity to the masculine *mind*, so a woman, by whom he was always attended, belonged

Jahveh, and it is accidental that Simon adopted the idea of *standing* as expressing the fundamental notion of the Divine, while others, like the author of the Apocalypse, i. 4, adopted that of *being*. We have here a proof of the dependence of Samaritan learning on the Judeans.

[1] *οὐσίᾳ, δυνάμει, μεγέθει, ἀποτελέσματι*, vi. 2: again the number four, which with the number seven is a favourite one in this system.

[2] A terrible example amongst many similar ones of the rapid progress made by Philo's use of allegory; for Philo himself does not go so far as to make an essential difference between these two words, *De Mundi Opif.* § 23.

necessarily to him as his complement, whom he said he had delivered from her chains as 'the lost sheep,' and called Helena, as if she were the goddess Helena, sacred to the Greeks, about whom men had formerly similarly contended, and whom Stesichorus did not revile with impunity.[1] His Samaritan disciples, who after his death desired to see him worshipped as Zeus and Helena as Athene, carried out this notion further by teaching that Helena, as intelligence (*Ennoia*), answering to mind (*Noûs*), or as the daughter sprung from him as the father, and as such destined, according to his will, to become the mother of all pure spirits (angels and archangels), came down to bring forth these spirits, who then became creators of the world, but that she was then taken captive by them, because they desired to reign and not to be the children of a mother, and was shamefully forced, without returning to her father, to be born again and again in various bodies, and thus to sink ever lower, until Simon, having become a man, appeared, first, in love to deliver her, but then with her overcame at the same time the corrupt spirits (angels), appearing to the Samaritans as Father, to the Judeans by his illusive crucifixion as Son, and to the Heathen as the Holy Ghost, so that he might be called by any one of these names if only he was believed in as the true deliverer.[2] In this way all the world was to be flattered by this doctrine, that it might be drawn to accept it, all kinds of notions being thrown together that seemed likely to promote that object.

It need hardly be expressly remarked that Simon proposed to perform miracles, as he sought to imitate Christ and his Apostles. Of this we have the historical reminiscence in his surname of *Magus*; and as according to all appearances he was well acquainted with the physical sciences of the day, he may by means of his cunning and audacity, with perhaps the use of the name of Jahveh, which was then so common,[3] have performed some very surprising feats, as the great popularity which he undoubtedly enjoyed for a considerable time proves. But the accounts of this are partly later tradition,[4] and partly

[1] Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 26, had before spoken of this Helena as a courtesan whom Simon had met with in Tyre; the ideas of the Apophasis in this passage are the more correct; Justin also describes her as the ἔννοια πρώτη. But of course much that we find in Hippolytus vi. 19 must not be taken as said by Simon himself; and we do best to suppose that in the Apophasis, as used by Irenæus and Hippolytus, though what is said vi. 18 regarding the relation of the feminine and masculine powers comes from Simon himself, a pupil of his added the end vi. 19 after his death.

[2] Hippolytus vi. 19 may be largely supplemented and emended by aid of the corresponding ideas in Irenæus, and *vice versâ*.

[3] See *ante*, p. 20.

[4] E.g. that he commanded his disciples to bury him alive, as he would rise

pure invention.[1] The fact that he found such unusual honour amongst his Samaritan fellow-countrymen[2] may be partly explained from the great success which he obtained for a time in Rome[3] and amongst Heathen elsewhere, who were less able to distinguish his base imitation of Christianity from the genuine original. The Samaritans could now boast of being able to take part in the Messianic movements of these times with a contribution wholly peculiar to themselves; and the death of Simon, which took place, it appears, not far from Samaria, gave some of his most enthusiastic followers greater freedom to pursue their own objects under his name. Almost the whole of the Samaritan population were led astray by this delusion, and the entire life of the people was revolutionised accordingly. Simon's followers worshipped him and Helena as represented in beautiful images and pictures,[4] offering sacrifices before them; but as the fleshly element was from the first the chief thing in Simon's case, we need not be surprised that a distinction was made amongst his followers between secret and public doctrines, and that they were said to reject the sanctity of marriage.[5] But remnants of them were to be met with as late as the time of Origen and Eusebius.[6]

again on the third day, and that he then remained in his tomb, Hippol. vi. 20.

[1] E.g. that he attempted to fly in Rome and was accordingly dashed in pieces, an account with which the Clementine Homilies closed their elaborate description of the follies of this Magician (ii. 26, 34, xx. 13, and elsewhere) and of his contentions with Peter, only that the close of the Homilies has not been preserved; but it is evident that the tradition had come from this source into the *Const. Apost.* vi. 8, 9, the *Acta Petri et Pauli* (in Tischendorf's *Acta Apocry.* pp. 7 sq.) and so many other books.

[2] As Justin, whose evidence is most immediate, and many others afterwards testify.

[3] As appears clearly from the passage of Justin previously quoted, especially from the first and earliest in his *Apol.* i. We may also suppose without difficulty that a statue was erected to Simon in the reign of Claudius, as in the case of Josephus (*ante*, p. 18), and in those times such honours were readily bestowed. If Justin had not known this, he would undoubtedly not have looked for such a statue in Rome; but the one he actually found, according to his description *Apol.* i. 26, 56, was undoubtedly not to Simon, as may easily now be shown. He might, however, the more naturally confound a name like *Semoni* with *Simoni*, as in his native Aramaic dialect *Shem'ôn* was undoubtedly always spoken with the vowel *e* (comp.).

[4] Comp. also Eusebius in Pitra's *Spicil. Solesmense*, i. pp. 386, 465.

[5] Hippol. vi. 19; Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 13 *ad fin.*; comp. Origen, *Contra Cels.* vi. 11.

[6] See Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii. 11; Origen, *Contra Cels.* i. 57 (but comp. with vi. 11); and Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 13; comp. also with regard to the mention of him by the Sibyl, my *Abhandlung über die Sib. Bücher*, p. 89. I have not in previous editions of vol. vii. and viii. of this work considered it necessary to refer to the baseless idea that Simon never actually existed. There had not then nor has there since been discovered any solid reason for such a supposition. It can be entertained only by those who can put the Clementine Homilies and the Acts of the Apostles in the same category. But even if we had nothing further about Simon than what the Clementine Homilies relate, we should in that case have no reason to regard him as a purely fictitious person; comp. *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* ii. p. 260.

As, however, a clever impostor of this description, even although, like Simon, he may accomplish very great things during his life, readily finds a disciple who supposes that he can excel his master, so there soon arose a disciple of his, named Menander, from the Samaritan village Caparetæa,[1] who thought he could eclipse his skill in constructing systems and founding churches. The changes he made in the fundamental ideas of Simon's system are unimportant. Some things he carried out further, presented with much greater life and detail his conception of parts of the story of creation (which was always necessarily a chief part of these systems), while he let other things drop, as in his case being inapplicable; he had nothing to say (as we may easily suppose) about a Helena.[2] On the other hand, he was astute enough to perceive that it might be very prudent, in consideration of the growing tendency of the times, to adopt some more of the elements of Christianity. He made therefore a more rigid distinction between good and evil; placed Satan in opposition to the other world-creating angels; and regarded the 'God of the Judeans' as only a sort of brother of Satan's, to destroy whom he was sent from the incorporeal Father as His incarnate Son[3] with the 'spark of life' which was conveyed from him into his followers. But a special point was that he introduced baptism, and exaggerated the importance attached to it by Christianity. Through it that 'spark of life' of the invisible God, which would also make men physically immortal, was imparted by him;[4] so that the magic arts of Simon reappeared here simply in a new form. But while he required, as if it were the necessary means of promoting the great object of obtaining this spark of life, abstinence from all animal food, he condemned marriage in every form, as if this kind of abstinence were also necessary, and thus departed widely from Simon's followers in his manner of life. Yet he met with no following amongst the Samaritans themselves, though in the neighbouring Antioch of Syria he founded communities, the remnants of which Justin saw about the year 140 A.D.[5] For there must have been much that was

[1] Just. *Apol.* i. 26, 56: the name is probably only a contraction of כְּפַר עֲטָרָה, comp. vol. v. p. 97; on the other hand, the name Χαβραΐ in Theodor. *Hær.* i. 2 appears to be a corruption.

[2] All this follows from the account in Hippol. vii. 28, but must be supplemented largely and emended from the far shorter remarks in Justin and in Irenæus *Contra Hær.* i. 23. 5.

[3] Instead of παραγενέσθαι τὸν Χριστόν in Hippol. we must read παραγενέσθαι δε αὐτὸν ὡς Χριστόν, as he claimed to be like Christ; otherwise the words make no sense at all.

[4] That this is not stated in Hipp. is an unfortunate omission.

[5] If all this was so, it appears how possible it was that Hippolytus and other later writers, such as we find in *Const.*

attractive in his labours as well as in his writings, so that his influence on many later Gnostics was great.[1]

On the other hand, a certain Cleobius, although after Simon's death he also founded a society of his own, adhered much more closely to his master, being something like an apostle of his. Thorough Samaritans were in the habit of connecting him with their Simon, and were not less proud of him; and the adherents of both took an equally antagonistic position with regard to Christians, and endeavoured to injure them by books against them.[2] Cleobius probably attached a new and great importance to the form and influence of solemn and public *intercession*, so that his followers were called *Entychitæ*.[3]

Dositheus and other Samaritan Founders of Societies.

In this way Gnostics, influenced by the new Christian spirit, and still more opposing it with greater or less hostility, were the first to undermine the foundations of the public religious life of Samaria; and subsequent Christian teachers were quite right in regarding Simon of Gittha as the true inaugurator of Gnosticism, as the peculiar Christian form of the new search for wisdom, which, however, only too easily became anti-Christian. Yet the social religious life of Samaria, although the first to be exposed to such disorganising influences, was too inert and too firmly united to fall a prey to them without resistance. Some quite different teachers appeared, with no such airy speculations and high-flown claims, starting purely from the actual necessities of the true ancient Samaritan Community, and only advancing from them to Messianic aims and expectations. The age, in the first place, was favourable to innova-

Apost. vi. 18. 1, 2, and also Hegesippus, in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 22. 5, should disconnect him entirely from Simon and place him amongst the ordinary Gnostics.

[1] See Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 26; iv. 7.

[2] In Hegesippus, Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 22, we have only the name of the founder and of his followers, and can gather a few particulars about them only from the brief hints in the *Const. Apost.* vi. 8. 1; 16. 2. The name of the Cleobians is to be found in a mutilated form in قيلتاى in Abulfatch, p. 160. 4 sq., although he states that he had read instead of this name قطيطاى in a *Hebrew* (i.e. as in the N.T. a Palestine-Aramaic) manuscript.

[3] This name Ἐντυχῖται alone, for a section of the followers of Simon, with anti-legal and arrogant aims (similar to those of Simon), is found in Clem. *Strom.* vii. 17; but as it is there mentioned expressly as taken from the aims of the party, and may be with greatest probability derived from ἐντυχία in the above sense, we do best to place this section of the Simonians here. In Theodor. *Hær.* i. 1 the section appears, however, as Ἐντυχηταί and as distinct from the Κλεοβανοί. In Abulfatch, pp. 159. 12; 160. 3, 10; 161. 10, they are probably called بعوناى from صحا *to beseech*; they continued to exist, therefore, like the Cleobians, after Dositheus, and were then divided again into two new sections.

tions of all kinds; and while these thoroughly Samaritan teachers claimed to take their own sacred and ancient Law as the basis of their opposition to the Gnostics, they sought from that basis to introduce wholly new institutions and customs into their Community. In the next place, it was not so much Christianity as Judeanism to which they were opposed, a circumstance in complete conformity with the true Samaritan genius. So that it was from the first little doubtful to which side the victory within this truly Samaritan territory must in the end incline.

In the observance of the feasts a great and increasing difference had long existed between Samaritans and Judeans. As we can well understand, the former kept neither Purim [1] nor the other recent feasts that had grown up amongst the Judeans, and adhered, as in other respects so in this, much more closely to the Mosaic Law. But it was just the interpretation of this Law which was in many points in dispute; and throughout those centuries very free and very various views were held with regard to the true chronology.[2] There then came forward accordingly a Samaritan with the doctrine that there were only just seven Mosaic feasts, and that in their true order they commenced with the autumn, so that the month which had hitherto been regarded, after the customary language of the Pentateuch, as the seventh must be considered as the true beginning of the year, and the Passover must fall in the autumn, and the Feast of Tabernacles in the spring. The advocates of this innovation, which so deeply affected ordinary life, were called Sebûæans,[3] as they made the proper observance of the number seven of essential importance;[4] but they were probably also called Masbothæans from their founder.[5] There

[1] See vol. v. pp. 231 sq.

[2] As we see particularly from the *Book of Jubilees* referred to vol. i. p. 201 sq., which was earlier than Dositheus.

[3] The sect itself with this name is known to us only in the brief description of Epiphanias, *Hær.* 11, from which, however, it does not appear why they called themselves thus; but it is of great importance that he mentions them as the second of the four purely Samaritan sects. Their name only is given in Abulfatch, p. 131. 12–14, 17.

[4] This explains why the Samaritans down to our own time lay so much stress on the seven genuine Mosaic feasts: see *Antiquities*, p. 365. On the other hand, this name is not explained simply by what Epiphanias states.

[5] Some very late Hæresiologists (see Oehler's *Corpus Hær.* i. pp. 283, 303, 325) suppose, simply quoting each other's opinion, that they were people who taught that Christ desired that men should in every matter keep the Sabbath; but this looks too much like a mere conjecture based on their name. In the order in which Hegesippus, Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 22. 5, 7, mentions them twice they were not Christians, and according to all appearance may be best classed with the Sebûæans; but מַשְׁבֵּחַ could as well be the name of a man as מַחְסֵיָה, Jer. xxxii. 12, or similar ones. In the two passages of Hegesippus it is important to remember (1) that in his time it was customary to distinguish seven heresies as somewhat

was a certain mixture of truth in this view undoubtedly, and it is precisely this which was subsequently always preserved amongst the Samaritans in opposition to the Judeans; but the alteration of the time of the feasts, although for a while finding evidently much favour, was based too entirely upon an erroneous interpretation of the Pentateuch to obtain permanent adoption. The founder of this school, following the earlier Samaritan Sadducean schools, but advancing more boldly in the same direction, also taught that everything originated by chance, and that there was no providence and no immortality of the soul.[1]

The transformation of the Samaritan Community which Dositheus[2] attempted was much more radical; and he was undoubtedly a remarkable man, of whom we know too little. He was originally a Judean, and educated in the Rabbinical schools: he was also distinguished in Rabbinical learning, and was yet so little satisfied, for reasons not far to seek, with Rabbinism, and Judeanism generally, in fact, that he went over to the Samaritans, that he might carry out amongst them his schemes of reform. He was therefore a kind of successor of the priest Manasseh,[3] and, like him, produced a powerful impression amongst the Samaritans. But he only succeeded in founding amongst them a community which suffered under the exaggerations prevalent at this time; and though it left behind it many traces of his marked innovations, it could not have any perma-

older, from which the Gnostics had their origin; accidentally he mentions, § 5, only the five which were derived from Simon, Cleobius, Dositheus, Goroatheus, and Masbothæus; (2) that in a wholly different connection, § 7, he places together likewise seven heresies, but they are such as existed within the ancient nation 'against the tribe of Juda and against Christ,' i.e. such as had rejected this tribe (from which Christ came) as specially favoured, or Christ also (for this is the meaning of the sentence ἦσαν δὲ γνῶμαι διάφοροι ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ ἐν υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ τῶν κατὰ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ); and as such he enumerates (1) the Essenes, who certainly on their principles could not acknowledge any superiority of this tribe; (2) the Galileans, who might likewise be unable to admit such a superiority inasmuch as they placed so much confidence in Moses (see vol. vi. pp. 55 sq.); (3) the Hemerobaptists, of whom we shall have to speak below; (4) the Masbothæans; and (5) the Samaritans (so correctly were both still ranked together), in whose case the rejection of the superiority followed as matter of course, and (6, 7) the Sadducees and Pharisees, who rejected Christ. Thus understood, the meaning of the passage is clear.

[1] As we see from the remark in the *Const. Apost.* vi. 6. 1, where the name has been corrupted into *Basmothæans*. It is not surprising that they are here generally classed with the Judeans. The name occurs, though much altered, in Abulfatch, *Ann.* p. 164. 4–9, as نسقوطاى; here also the denial of the resurrection is ascribed to them. Sadducees also are mentioned, p. 160. 15.

[2] The name was common in those parts (like Dorotheus in others); several Rabbis bore the name דוֹסְתַּי. Our Dositheus is called بن ذوقلى in Abulfatch's *Ann.* p. 151. 11. The name was further contracted into the Rabbinic דּוֹסָא, دوسة in Abulfatch, p. 160. 17.

[3] See vol. v. pp. 213 sq.

nency.[1] In opposition to the Pharisees, he was inclined to a very strict interpretation of the Bible; and, as he did not find the Pharisaic view of the resurrection of the dead in the Pentateuch, he went evidently on that account in the first instance over to the Samaritans, who, like the Sadducees, had never firmly adopted that view.[2] Piety and acceptance before God he sought to produce by the most scrupulous interpretation and application of certain precepts of the Pentateuch: required on the Sabbath the cessation of every movement and occupation,[3] the limitation of the fasts not to the one annual fast-day, and the most careful avoidance of all contact with anything which could remotely pollute.[4] But although he incidentally introduced genuine Judean elements, and, if possible, in a new form, requiring, for instance, that *Elohim* (God) should be spoken instead of Jahveh, in general he laid claim much more to full independence in the reconstruction of the Community, wished to be regarded as the prophet like unto Moses promised in Deuteronomy,[5] and introduced a new mode of reckoning the

[1] The work of Eulogius on the Samaritan parties has been lost except a few extracts in Photius' *Bibl.* cod. 230, p. 285, ed. Bekk.; also the beginning of the work of Hippolytus 'against thirty-two heresies,' which dealt with the Dositheans, as we see from Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 121, p. 94, ed. Bekk. The principal source of our present knowledge of Dositheus and his teaching is Abulfatch (in De Sacy's *Chrest. Arab.* i. pp. 332–37, and in Vilmar's ed. of the *Ann.* pp. 82. 3–83. 15; 151. 11–157. 9; but two wholly different early sources have been used by Abulfatch, according to one of which Dositheus is called Dostân and is referred to a too early period, whilst according to the other he is called Dûsîs and is placed too late; and here the history of his successors follows his, pp. 159. 12–162. 11. Next Shahrastâni speaks with most clearness for us concerning him in the *Kitâb el Milal.* p. 170, whence Abulfida also obtained information, *Hist. Anteislam.* p. 160. In Shahrastâni he is called Dostân (the Greeks had already spoken of Δοσθής, Δοσθηνοί, see Eulogius in Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 230); but his Greek name was varied by the Hebrew אֶלְקָן or חִלְקָן, the name الثان (as Abulfida probably more correctly read than الالثان) being thus explained. But when Shahrastâni makes him live 100 years B.C. we shall probably be right in supposing that *after* Christ should be read, as the mention of the name in Hegesippus (Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 22. 5) and in Origen, *Contra Cels.* i. 57, vi. 11, as well as all other indications, shows. In the Clementines, *Hom.* ii. 24 (which do not know Menander) he appears also as younger than Simon and as jealous of this his master, and is vanquished by him; the inversion of the names in the *Recognitions*, ii. 8, has no historical significance; and it is of no moment that Simon appears after Dositheus in Abulfatch, pp. 157. 11–159. 11 (where his contest in Rome and his end are related).

[2] According to Epiph. *Hær.* xiii. 1 sq. and Abulfatch p. 156. 14 sq. he had taught, quite on the contrary, the resurrection of the dead; but it is plain from all the authorities and indications that in this matter he was confounded with some later reconstructor of his doctrine, such as Gorotheus; see especially Philastrius *de Hær.* cap. 4, Eulogius and Shahrastâni.

[3] According to Origen, περὶ ἀρχῶν, iv. 17 also.

[4] لا مساس *noli tangere*! appears therefore still in Mohammed, *Sur.* xx. 87–97, as a genuine Samaritan characteristic; comp. Abulfatch, *Ann.* p. 175. 6.

[5] According to Origen, *Contra Cels.* i. 57, vi. 11, he professed that he himself was Christ and Son of God; but the account of Eulogius and Shahrastâni, that he claimed to be the prophet promised by Moses (Deut. xviii. 15), whom Origen only considered to be Christ, accords much better with his character. The

months as each of thirty days [1]—a sign of the want of fixity of everything of this kind amongst the Samaritans in our period. He must have worked really with considerable success for a time in such efforts, which were calculated completely to reconstruct the Samaritan Community, and have trained a number of enthusiastic disciples. Some of the details of his reforms evidently possessed some permanency. It is true, we know that the more his supremacy was extended, with the more hostility was he himself resisted, and, indeed, driven beyond the Samaritan borders, by the largest portion of the Samaritans. It was said later, satirically, that he perished in his twenty-eighth year, in a cave not far from Jerusalem, in consequence of too rigorous fasting, in conformity with his false philosophy.[2] But after his death he was the more held by very many to be a holy prophet.[3] Followers of his were to be found for a long time, and formed distinct communities. But they were accused of having interpolated the Pentateuch—a charge which the Samaritans generally had often to bear.[4]

As if to supplement his claims, there arose amongst the Samaritans, as far as we can see, a certain Gorothai, or Gorthai, who proposed, on the contrary, to make everything Samaritan thoroughly Judean, taught the resurrection of the dead, and wished to have the feasts kept exactly as they were amongst the Judeans.[5] But the Messianic hopes, which had

Samaritan party hostile to him maintained, it is true, falsely and with true Samaritan narrowness, that this prophet was Joshua only. As both Simon and Dositheus, according to Clem. *Hom.* ii. 24, had each thirty disciples, Origen remarks satirically in both passages that in his time neither the one nor the other had thirty followers left in the whole world.

[1] A reckoning which had long been observed in countries farther to the East, as even the Book of Daniel shows, comp. *Prophets of the Old Test.* vol. v. p. 308.

[2] An end of this kind is indicated in the brief words of the *Const. Apost.* vi. 8. 1; and Abulfatch, p. 337 (ed. De Sacy), gives a more detailed account.

[3] A very vivid reminiscence of all this is supplied in the popular story in Abulfatch, *Ann.* pp. 151. 11–157. 9.

[4] See Eulogius in Photius, and even as late as Mas'udi's *Morudsch-alzehab*, i. p. 120, ed. Sprenger

[5] From Hegesippus we learn merely the name, and the information in Epiphan. *Hær.* 12 is in the highest degree meagre. The best reminiscence of this party, as the antipodes of the Dositheans, has been preserved in the Arabic works used by Shahrastâni, where they are called الكرثانية or even الكوسانية, the *r* being easily left out after و, or the latter written instead of it. The word cannot mean the Cutheans (*ante*, p. 83). The Dositheans and Gortheans were accordingly the two latest parties. The brief references of Hegesippus (who in his time might know well all these parties) in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 22. 7 may thus be fully explained. But the Genistæ and Meristæ, who are mentioned likewise amongst the pre-Christian and non-Christian parties, though only in the latest and least reliable heresiologies (Oehler, *Corpus* i. pp. 283, 303, 325), cannot be recognised from the brief descriptions given of them, and have evidently rather fictitious names, and probably denote two schools which differed in so far that the one regarded the sole Messianic salvation as necessary for *all* Judeans (the usual Pharisaic doctrine), the other as only intended for individuals; the latter were such as the Essenes and all the Baptists subsequent to John the Baptist.

been so intensely strained by Dositheus and similar men amongst the Samaritans, aroused in the case of not a few the most revolutionary movements and violent demands on fortune, just like those which were made by the Judeans in the Apostolic age.[1] If we add that the Essenes also undoubtedly sought previously in a characteristic manner to come to terms with Samaritanism and to settle amongst the Samaritans,[2] we get ample evidence of the excessively restless and agitated life of the Samaritan Community at this period, forming remarkable combinations with the various Gnostic movements.

But in the end the old Samaritan principles carried off the victory in this second branch of the ancient Community, especially after the fresh and wide devastations, to be described below, which brought about the end of this entire period in the days of Bar-Cocheba. Those of the Samaritans who did not go over to Christianity returned more and more, after these times of violent commotion and numerous unsuccessful efforts, to their previous Community, in which, however, these commotions left many marked traces. After a few centuries there scarcely survived amongst them a dim recollection of those great movements and divisions, and the schismatic communities of Dositheans only were perpetuated into the Middle Ages. For in all these divisions more or less error and self-seeking were at work, and none of them made the commencement of a thorough reform. Nevertheless, there was especially one fundamental thought which, in addition to other innovations, remained to the Samaritans from those profound mental and religious movements, and which afterwards most powerfully affected their entire religious view of things. This was the idea that the happy period of the past of this Samaritan nation lasted only till the time when the legitimate sacerdotal family was set aside by Eli,[3] the true Mosaic Ark of the Covenant, with its sacred house,[4] disappeared[5] from mortal sight, and the beginning of the great, dark, still existing, misery of the ages arrived. This misery, it was thought, would

[1] See vol. vii. pp. 414, 423, 425. The account in Abulfatch of this nature, p. 160. 16 sq., can hardly have been taken from Josephus.

[2] Epiphan. *Hær.* 10. His account of four strictly Samaritan heresies is in so far quite correct, but the insignificant cause to which he traces their origin is very erroneous, as well as his derivation of the Sadducees from Dositheus, comp. *Hær.* 14, whilst the opposite is rather the case. Abulfatch also, *Ann.* ed. Vilmar, p. 102. 12 sq., states that Essenes gladly joined the Samaritans.

[3] Vol. ii. pp. 408 sq.

[4] הַמִּשְׁכָּן, Abulfatch, *Ann.* p. 160. 8; 161. 7; *Antiquities*, p. 322.

[5] הֶפְקֵנוּת, *disappearance*, in opposition to what is briefly named the *παρουσία*.

not end until *he that should return*[1] should appear—Moses, that is, who was regarded by them both as the one true prophet and the future Messiah. A view like this of the past and future and the conditions of salvation could not arise amongst the Samaritans before these times, and be worked out in the largely read book of one of their Gnostics. But afterwards it continued to be steadfastly held amongst them, as it represented most distinctly and comprehensively all their ideas and hopes.

II.

THE SEPARATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

FROM A.D. 70 TO ABOUT 135.

The new Freedom and new Duties of the Period.

Thus in these first decades the two ancient Communities sought, each in its own way, to rise gradually from the mortal blow, which had struck them both almost simultaneously, to the beginning of new life and growth. What an entirely different position Christianity now occupied at the commencement of the new period! It might, in the view of the wide world, be still regarded during the first decades after the destruction of Jerusalem as only a specific branch of Judeanism, and the wisest as well as the proudest Judean might continue to dislike to say much about it before the great Heathen world.[2] But in fact the distinct separation from the ancient Community, to which it was impelled from the very first by its inmost nature, had been effected with surprising rapidity by the Divine judgment which had overtaken that Community. The separation had also been made irrevocable, although some Christians might still be unwilling to believe in its absolute

[1] הַתָּהֵב from תּוּב=שׁוּב. The belief of the *return* of Moses is implied in *Liber Josuæ*, capp. 6, 7, and *Sib.* v. 255 sq.; comp. vol. vi. pp. 65 sq. That the Samaritans thought of a return of Joshua is less probable. In itself the word may, it is true, be applied to another Messiah; but according to the Samaritan view, as expressed in the *Liber Jos.* cap. 7. 39, Joshua died an ordinary death, but not Moses. Comp., however, above, p. 95, note.

[2] We see this especially in the attitude which the Judean historians of this period assume towards Christianity. Josephus evidently dislikes to speak of it, passes it over altogether without notice in his *Bell. Jud.*, and in his *Ant.* says no more than he is absolutely compelled as we have seen vol. vi. pp. 138 sq. And Justus of Tiberias (*ante* 74), as Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 33, expressly states, left it wholly without mention. Similarly, although for other reasons, the poets of this period, such as Juvenal and Martial, have much to say of Judeans but not of Christians (see *ante*, p. 20); and the historians, such as Suetonius, Tacitus, Plutarch, either pass it by, or, when they must refer to it, speak of it in the most unintelligible way.

necessity under every circumstance. The first tremendous national disaster which befell its mother, from whom alone it could derive its origin, and in whose care alone it could at first grow up, had torn it from her side, the Divine necessity of the separation being shown the more clearly as it took place against its own will. It had now also attained absolute independence in the world, with an abundance of new and magnificent treasures, as we saw above.[1]

But the most important advantage which Christianity now forthwith obtained by this vast revolution was, that it was set free from that internal uncertainty and division which had been growing in consequence of the labours of the Apostle Paul; for now, without his assistance, the last tie which continued to bind it to the ancient Community ever since the rise of the Apostolic Church was rent asunder. The entire outward form of the kingdom of God in which Christ had laboured until His crucifixion, and within which so many of the noblest and most conscientious Christians felt obliged, by Christ's own instruction, to wait for the celestial consummation of His work, had been destroyed. The more timid Christians, who had felt an obligation to oppose more or less the daring innovations of Paul, could not longer cling to the Temple in any way, or with that view appeal to hints and prophecies of Christ, after the terrible event had supplied the best interpretation of them. Indeed, after the Temple had been so totally destroyed and no wise man could well hope for its restoration, even many of the exhortations and discussions which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews had a few years before considered necessary [2] had become superfluous. And now it soon appeared also what an unexpected advantage for the final victory of the perfect true religion was involved in the fact that the sacred institutions of the ancient Community had for so many centuries been so completely and closely concentrated in this one Temple alone, as in their true focus, that no other temple anywhere in the world could take its place. For, however many disadvantages might in the course of centuries be connected therewith,[3] it was now in the end a great gain for Christianity that, with the destruction of this one sacred place, a holy centre of the Judean religion, according to the ancient traditions and the general view of Judeanism, had been rendered impossible; that the ancient sacrifices, if it had been desired, could nowhere be presented again; and that all the past power of the Hagiocracy had been suddenly and irrevocably over-

[1] *Ante*, pp. 21 sq. [2] See vol. vii. pp. 476 sq. [3] Vol. iii. pp. 305 sq.

thrown.[1] Thus the gradual restriction of the whole ancient sacrificial system to the one Temple—a restriction which was rendered necessary on account even of the greater dignity of these sacrifices, which could only with difficulty be presented worthily[2]—was simply a transition to their complete discontinuance.

All the different advantages of this kind which Christianity now obtained as it were in a night, combined to produce the result that, having been delivered from the last earthly ties which bound it to the ancient Community, it now first attained full freedom perfectly to develop itself entirely according to its own genius. Thus quickly had those times arrived which Paul had struggled to see; but that they now came, so that the new Church might shortly be easily separated from the old, as ripe fruit from a decaying trunk, was really his work mainly, as far as human effort could in this case co-operate. For, as far as human perception can reach, how entirely otherwise must have been the course of history if, from the beginning of the Apostolic age, Christianity had still remained scarcely separable from the bosom of the ancient Community, and had in that case been surprised by the terrible and decisive calamities of 66 A.D. and following years; if it had not then been already thrown mainly amongst the Heathen, and had not become so independent, both as regards knowledge and doctrine, as well as in the development of its church-life and in its wide dispersion in the world, and so clearly distinguishable from the ancient Community that it was connected with it only by a very loose tie. But as Christianity, mainly through Paul's heroic genius, had during the previous twenty or thirty years developed more and more complete independence before the great war, even the terrible storm of the last years had not come too early to tear it, even violently, from its ancient trunk; and if it could not perhaps exist any longer in the ancient country as devastated by that storm, it could now the more freely unfold its young life in Heathen lands.

And for the second time in its life it was now again a mighty impetus from heaven itself which gave new vigour to its young energies, raised it above innumerable dangers, and impelled it onwards to its true destination with irresistible force. As after the crucifixion of its Lord it had been mysterious powers of purely Divine necessity which, contrary to all human expectation and purpose, gave it strength to rise and to exist for

[1] As Justin, *Dial. c. Tryp.* cap. 46, properly urges.
[2] Comp. also *Antiquities*, pp. 129 sq.

the first time on the earth without its visible Lord, so now again it was as it were purely celestial forces which, without human help or co-operation, threw it into this new position and impelled it to continue therein, and to hasten to meet its great future. No assistance can be more helpful to an historical development than favourable necessities which a period brings with it independently of human will, when celestial powers themselves point out the right course, and a few unexpected moments land men on the other side of innumerable dark abysses. In such cases hidden powers and undeveloped spiritual resources, which have long been waiting, quickly reach the fairest perfection; and thus infant Christianity had long been properly prepared, when mild breezes after those storms should fan it, to grow most rapidly, and to mature ripening fruit, if it only used well the freedom which was now so unexpectedly offered, and avoided the new dangers which here again soon arose.

For undoubtedly the thing of first importance was the use which it would make of this new freedom, which arose so unexpectedly for it out of the great temptations and sufferings of the previous period. How would the new church develop itself when it had full freedom to do so? The previous period had attempted and creatively commenced the boldest and most tremendous enterprises upon the firm foundation which Christ himself had laid; but in consequence of the great novelty of the work, undertaken amid the most difficult labours and the most oppressive persecutions, it had been unable to give to anything sufficient completeness. It was not until the period before us that everything had to be more fully and firmly constructed, if it was to last for all time; and it was only now that the needful freedom to do this had been granted.

This freedom was really nothing else than the removal of the yoke which the ancient Community had hitherto imposed on the new one, although a reimposition of the yoke was threatened by a fresh attempt to abrogate that freedom. But in the wide Heathen world freedom had not been therewith attained. On the contrary, with the entire separation from the ancient Community which was gradually accomplished, many protecting securities and privileges which the new Community had hitherto shared with the old one, ceased, and Christianity had now for the first time been thrust out into the wide world as without any temporal protection whatever. If the new Community was for the future so far free from the external yoke of the old one that it could not easily be ever imposed on it again, it was connected with its mother from the very first, as her nearest and best

child, by a thousand ties, and so tenaciously that the question now seriously arose how the child would let go the tenderest ties which still bound the two together. And, finally, the freedom itself which had now been granted, and was about to be further developed in relation to Heathenism too, might really, as soon as it was earnestly taken up, be easily misused in many ways in a community which, without any fixed outward restrictions, had been thrust forth into the wide world, and which, moreover, had inherited from its earliest moments the spirit of loftiest independence. In all this, therefore, there lay the germs of innumerable new perils which threatened the young life of Christianity just when it put forth its highest efforts, as set free from its parent trunk, to bear its first ripe fruit in the world. And there lay in all this also new duties which it had now to fulfil, and new struggles which must now be fought out.

The entire history of this age of Christianity lies in the shaping of this new freedom and in the vigorous resistance of the growing dangers which were arising in this first stage of its life and work in the world at large. It is already the time of the first great harvest, when the germ of the consummation, which Christ had planted securely and deeply in the earth, and the full bloom of which met us in the Apostolic age, begins to yield its first ripe fruits for the salvation of all mankind, and when Christianity itself, as the ripe fruit of this entire national history, already shone upon by the full light of the world, obtains its enduring place in the whole human race. And if this period, like the preceding one, is still filled by great movements and storms in Christendom itself, they originate less with individual heroes in a convulsive effort, as those occupying the highest summits of attainment, but they rather permeate and purify and mature the entire widely extended body in a more equal and uniform manner.

General Characteristics of the Christians in these Years.

But if we turn from the new situation which was now opening before the Christians, to look more closely at the Christians themselves as a body, we cannot expect that they should have sought at once to get the control of public affairs and the government of the world. A tendency of this kind was, at all events at the beginning of this period, still quite foreign to Christians. All their longing and expectation, their hearts and their faces, were still directed, with almost the same in-

wardness and strength as before, solely to the celestial Christ and His outward kingdom to be revealed straight from heaven. Indeed, at the beginning of this period the fervour of this primitive hope of Christianity as bereaved of the visible Christ, was fed afresh by the view of those genuine Christians who saw in the destruction of Jerusalem an evident sign of the movement of the mysterious power of Divine judgment and a prelude of the universal judgment itself.[1] They continued, therefore, for the most part to hold aloof in retirement from the world, united only amongst themselves by the same hope and the same supreme love, a little band of men such as the earth had never seen before, wholly unlike both Judeans and Heathen. The rich treasures of primitive Christian virtue were, therefore, primarily displayed only in the narrower circles of the Church and the family. But what a new life grew strong in these circles, and what purity from the terrible sins of the old world; and what daring courage amid all trials, in the joyful feeling of the nearness of the great Judge, tended to become habitual there, may be seen clearly enough in individual instances,[2] and is still more evident in the entire spiritual condition of the Christians of those days. Too numerous and too strong links still connected this period with that of the terrestrial glory of Christ and of his immediate disciples to allow the Christians of our time to become in the essential points of Christian life

[1] See *ante*, pp. 24 sq.

[2] Take, for instance, only the artless descriptions in the *Epist.* of Clement, i. ii., or the very unintentional ones in Pliny, *Epist.* x.*97, and no doubt can be felt as to the truth of what is said above. From a not much later date, compare in Minucius Felix's *Octavius* the fine description of the charges laid against the Christians in Rome and of their actual character; or take the Epistle to Diognetus, to be spoken of below, and what has been said will not be deemed exaggerated. When even Lucian of Samosata, who was well acquainted with the Christians, in spite of all his eager desire to ridicule them, is rather compelled to praise them, as his *Death of Peregrinus* proves, we have therein only a repetition of the powerlessness of Balaam against Israel, Num. xxii–xxiv. And if they were censured by the old Heathen physicians on account of their new way of healing the body, as we see from Rev. ii. 12, 13 (comp. my *Johanneische Schriften*, ii. pp. 133 sq., with the long poem in the *Corp. Insc. Græc.* ii. p. 856, and W. Wright's *Syrian Martyrology*, London, 1865, p. 4. 1–3), and from Galen's medical works (but comp. also his more favourable judgment preserved in Abulfida's *Ann. Anteisl.* p. 108), it appears from what we have seen previously (vol. vi. pp. 221 sq.; vii. pp. 113 sq.) that what was needful was to have observed and appropriated the new spirit with which Christ treated such evils, whilst Galen did not even distinguish Christianity from Judeanism.

However, the ancient graves of Rome and of Italy, in the first instance, begin now to tell of the condition of the Judeans and the Christians in this period. The oldest remnant of a Christian grave in Rome is, according to these discoveries, from the year 71, the next from the year 107. Comp. De Rossi's great work, *Inscriptiones Christianæ urbis Romæ*, t. i. (Rome, 1861), and Raf. Garrucci's *Cimeterio degli antichi Ebrei scoperto recentamente in Vigna Randanini*, Roma, 1862. (For further and later information on this point, see the authorities in Schürer's *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, vol. ii. (1886), pp. 510 sq.—Tr.)

so very unlike their predecessors. The whole Church was still directly influenced by the breath and spirit, and, indeed, by the eye of its celestial Lord, and for a long time to come it trembled with fear at the nearness of His coming in glory to punish the unfaithful and to reward the true. And thus that new race of men which was born in the Apostolic age, which bore in its bosom the true fruit of the past two thousand years of the growth of true religion, and was alone capable of surviving either the decease of the old Community of true religion or that of the ancient world generally, grew constantly stronger in this new age.

But if we desire to fully understand the dangers and the conflicts which, as we have said, now awaited the new Church, we must further remember that the general body of Christian people had in this period become in other respects very different from what it was at the beginning of the previous age.

The great hero-soldiers of the new faith, who in the previous age had won for that faith the early respect of the world and opened for it new courses far and wide, had already for the most part passed away, most of them carried off earlier than usual by the severe storms and toils of the period. We saw above[1] how James the Lord's brother, Peter and Paul, the three strongest pillars of the new Church, met martyrdom; we know also, from an early simple reminiscence,[2] that of the Apostles, besides John, Matthias, Philip, Thomas, and Levi,[3] did not die a martyr's death. But as regards the various deeds and the circumstances of the death of the other great leaders of the previous age, we have now too little and too detached information of a trustworthy character to be able to give any strictly historical narrative of important events that befell them.[4] With regard to the Twelve, it was subsequently the custom to enumerate simply the countries into which each had gone to preach the Gospel,[5] and of their number it is evident

[1] Vol. vii.

[2] Heracleon in Clement's *Strom.* iv. 9.

[3] Vol. vi. p. 304.

[4] The order as regards historical information and value in which the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, as far as yet published, should be placed, I have discussed in the *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* iv. pp. 227 sq. Eusebius even could no longer learn anything of a connected nature with regard to the lives of most of the Apostles, as appears from his remarks and incidental utterances, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 1, comp. iii. 31; v. 10, 24; and the accounts by Christians of Edessa of the journeys of Thaddeus and Addeus (in Cureton's *Ancient Syriac Documents*, 1864), and by the Malabars of the journeys of Thomas (in Land's *Anecdota Syr.* i.), were not written until later times, comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1864, p. 810; 1865, pp. 1494–98. What was told of Andrew appears from the Book of the Ascension of the Virgin (published in Syriac by W. Wright, London, 1865).

[5] This account has even found its way into Abulfatch, *Ann.* p. 107. 10–12: the Samaritans generally speaking more leniently of the Christians than was the habit of the Judeans. That in this account

from trustworthy indications[1] that it was the Apostle John only who lived far into this age; his activity in it, indeed, being of greatest importance, as we shall see. But, in general, it was quite a new Christian generation which had to meet the serious problems of this age.

And this new generation, quite unlike that of the commencement and the middle of the previous age, was for the most part of Heathen extraction; so rapidly in this respect had the Christian Church been changed. From the time of Paul, it is true, even elders and deacons of Heathen descent had gradually been elected; but that now those of Heathen birth should more and more take in most various ways even the leadership of the Church, must have produced a great change in many respects, but especially in the expression of Christian ideas. At first there were probably a few Christian authors of Heathen extraction who had altered their language and style more or less after the Hellenistic manner, a plain instance of which we have in Luke,[2] and another probably in Clement (see below). But gradually Heathen-Christian writers emancipate themselves completely from the Hellenistic style and write on Christian matters as purely after the Greek model as possible in point of language and illustration, examples of which will soon meet us. And it is remarkable to observe how quickly the most characteristically Christian ideas are clothed in the choicest Greek language. These Heathen-Christian authors show also much greater facility in representing, often with new and expressive words, the full extent of the difference between Christianity and Judeanism, which now comes more and more clearly to light, whilst Christians of Judean descent rarely present it so undisguisedly and strongly as the Apostle Paul, and use more frequently ancient sacred figures.

And these Churches, formed generally to a very large extent of new materials, were soon spread throughout the entire Roman empire, although in some of its countries, especially Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece, they were situated more closely together than in others. It is historically well attested that Christianity soon spread far beyond the limits of the Roman empire, and that many of its missionaries

James is sent to Aelia, or Jerusalem, arises from a frequent confusion of the Apostle with the Lord's brother.

[1] For in the account, in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 31, 37 (1), 39 (9), v. 24, of the stay of the Apostle Philip in Hierapolis in Phrygia, and of his four prophetic virgin daughters, of whom two were buried with him in Hierapolis, and one in Ephesus, there is probably a confusion with Philip the Evangelist, see vol. vii. pp. 178, 400; likewise in the statement in Clement, *Strom.* iii. 6, that the Apostle Philip sanctioned the marriage of his daughters.

[2] See vol. vii. p. 29.

early went forth, not without success, into the most distant lands.[1] It is just the times immediately after the greatest revolutions which are the most favourable for the spread in such forms as these of a new manner of life; and as Christianity immediately after the first feast of Pentecost was most rapidly propagated amongst the Judeans in the world at large, either as a simple proclamation or as an adopted faith,[2] so the period immediately succeeding the destruction of Jerusalem was the best adapted for its publication beyond the confines of the Roman empire. But as Christianity arose in the Roman empire, and in consequence of the close connection of its numerous countries was first extended most easily over them equally, its present preliminary fortunes in the earth were about to be determined by its power to subjugate those countries in the first instance, with their very uniform degree of culture, so as thus to transform the first great secular empire with which it came into contact into a Christian one. And wherever it might now spread, it was everywhere, whether in single individuals or in communities, scarcely tolerated by the secular governments, and often suspected and bitterly persecuted on account of its innovations. It had everywhere to suffer under both the ill-will of the Judeans and all the innumerable prejudices and hostilities of the Heathen, while it was not held together by a firm external bond of any kind, and the great Apostles had passed away whose names and influence had in the previous age served as a strong rallying point.

We must realise this situation clearly if we wish to correctly understand the Christianity of those days with all that was then at stake and taking place in it. In this way we also get an explanation of some things which at first sight strike us as surprising; for instance, that not a few of the best Christians recalled, as from the grave, into new life the names and reputations of the great departed Apostles, that they might produce an effect by writings professing to be written by those Apostles; and this expedient becomes the more intelligible to us when we remember that amongst all ancient nations a literary licence of this description was early developed.

But the greatest and most decisive thing was that with all this the same genuine spirit of the perfect true religion, which had been so powerful in the previous age, laying foundations

[1] The earliest writers known to us who testify this are the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, cap. 5; Justin *Dial. c. Tryp.* cap. 117; Minucius Felix, *Oct.* cap. 9; comp. also Hermæ Pastor, iii. 8. 3; 9. 17.

[2] See vol. vii. pp. 312 sq.

and building up churches, remained in this long period the same, preserving all that was good and warding off all that was dangerous. In the case of all truly Christian efforts and conflicts already the great thing was rather a faithful preservation of what had previously been founded, and brave fighting or undaunted suffering for it, than inaugurating anything new. And while Christians in this frame of mind were all along waiting, with strong desire and yet by degrees with greater calmness, for the coming of their celestial Lord in His glory, we behold Christianity at length emerge from all the new and serious perils of this time, with the gain of new and great treasures, and see it win the great perfect victory which it was possible for it to carry off in this period of its complete separation from the ancient Community. It is just this which we must now observe more in detail. The Heathen who entered this society, which at last rose above the sins of the whole world, had more and more to rise to the full height and glory of Christ; the Judeans who came into it or remained faithful to it had to learn to give up the last remains of their old narrowness; and the entire period shows in what a great degree this was accomplished. But that we may observe how it was accomplished more in detail, we must first consider:

1. *The Final Form of Christian Ideas and Hopes.*

1. *The Relation of the New Religion to the Old.*

The so-called Epistle of Barnabas.

Many constituent elements of Christian thought and hope could not before this age receive their more definite form; of this there can be no doubt. The development of the thought of the previous age had been too suddenly interrupted, and very many things which had not at their first fresh origination been in that age sufficiently worked out, might in this greatly altered period be perceived far more definitely and with much greater finality. But if we look at the details in this respect, we see that it is, after all, mainly one important view which could now be brought into the foreground with a certainty and assurance such as it had previously never obtained: that was the view of the relation of the new religion to the old one. For history itself, with its peculiar lucidity and power, had now taught it, so that all that was wanting was its proper apprehension and the full grasp of its consequences; and it was a great gain

that this now took place in the Church, and that the truth was set forth and explained in eloquent writings.

As soon as the new position of Christianity in relation to the destroyed Temple had been sufficiently made manifest, we meet with a widely circulated book, which appeared at the call of a special occasion, and the real object of which was to speak by exhortation and instruction to the Christian churches as to the true way of understanding the relation of the new to the old religion. This is the book which has from ancient times, though without sufficient reason, been called the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and which we are at last able to read in the complete Greek original.[1] It cannot be doubted that this epistle appeared not very many years after the destruction of the Temple; it alludes plainly enough to the great signs just given of the Divine displeasure which the people of Israel had experienced,[2] to the almost Heathen form of reverence which it cherished towards the Temple then destroyed in war,[3] and to the dispersion of the people as already accomplished.[4] But the writer indicates plainly enough the time in which he addressed himself with this pamphlet to the churches, and the special occasion which called it forth; it only requires that we correctly interpret the words with which he indicates the peculiar circumstances of that time, and the Messianic hope which he found therein.

As the destruction of Jerusalem had gone by without the fulfilment of the hope of an external consummation of the Christian kingdom, such as was expressed, for instance, in the Book of Revelation,[5] many Christians might then, under the calamities of the times in which they still continued to live, wonder, whenever a new and unexpected turn of the public affairs of the Roman empire occurred, whether the consummation had at last come nearer. To our author, as to the writer of the Apocalypse, Daniel's fourth empire was the Roman;[6] but while that writer could not as yet apply the ten horns, which the beast representing this empire bears in the Book of Daniel, to the empires of the Roman Cæsars, this reference was easy for the author of our epistle, and therewith a Divine light

[1] In the *Codex Sin.*, from which Tischendorf published the missing portion of the Greek text in Dressel's *Patres Apostolici*, 1863. We see from this how unsatisfactory the ancient Latin translation of the first chapter is, and can form an opinion on many other points more certainly now that we have the Greek before us. [We have now another Greek original in the Constantinopolitan MS., edited by Hilgenfeld, Gebhardt, and others, since 1877.]

[2] Cap. iv. *ad fin.*

[3] Cap. xvi.

[4] Cap. xvi. and cap. v. after Zech. xiii. 7.

[5] See vol. vii. p. 527.

[6] Barn. iv., comp. Rev. xi. 7.

seemed to him to arise in the dark night of those disastrous times. For when he saw the series of the ten horns finished in the emperors from Augustus to Domitian,[1] to him there seemed in Nerva, who had then, after the fall of the Flavian house with its three emperors, just succeeded to the throne, to be but the little weak subsidiary horn, which, according to the Book of Daniel, is the last Heathen ruler before the arrival of the Messiah in his celestial glory;[2] and a new prospect of the consummation of the final Messianic hopes seemed to our author to be thus opened.

This new outlook into the veiled future our author considers of sufficient importance not to be kept back from his readers; but it was at bottom something else which was far more influential in inducing him then to take up his pen, and something which was at the same time somewhat closely connected with the overthrow of the Flavian dynasty. It concerned the Temple at Jerusalem. This had been destroyed by Titus, contrary to his original intention; it is not surprising, therefore, that he most likely confidentially promised some of the leading Judeans, such as Josephus, that he would restore it at a convenient time.[3] After Vespasian had imposed the tax to Jupiter, this appeared, it is true, very unlikely; although there will not have been wanting repeated petitions with this object. But under Nerva (as we shall see) a great change in all these relations occurred in favour of the Judeans. Nerva promised, or at all events it was then generally supposed in Egypt and Palestine that he had certainly promised, that the Temple should be rebuilt with Roman assistance, as is once incidentally mentioned in our epistle without Nerva's name;[4] and we shall

[1] To understand this we must remember (1) that to our author, as well as to the writer of the Apocalypse, not Cæsar but Augustus was the first Roman monarch, as, in fact, he was the first Roman monarch in Palestine and Egypt; and (2) that he did not count Vitellius, as he was not acknowledged in Palestine and Egypt, comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1858, pp. 1443 sq.; and our author undoubtedly wrote his epistle from Egypt. The view of the author of Fourth of Ezra was quite different, as we saw *ante*, 54; he wrote his book in Rome, and accordingly he, like Suetonius, regarded Domitian, not as the tenth, but as the twelfth Cæsar.

[2] Our author gives a somewhat free translation of his own of Dan. vii. 7, 8 (20), 23, 24, emphasising expressly the despicable littleness of this subsidiary horn and its subjugation of three great horns. This emphatic distinction between great and little horns reminds us of the precedent given 4 Ezra, cap. xi.; and that Nerva cast down three of these great horns was the more natural to suppose as the Flavian house which was displaced by him numbered three emperors. We must not forget that the whole passage is intended only as an interpretation of the passage from Daniel.

[3] Comp. *ante*, p. 17.

[4] Cap. xvi.: 'Now will also the servants of the Heathen themselves (i.e. the artists and all who carry out Cæsar's will) rebuild the Temple,' as if the prophecy Isa. xlix. 17 would only thereby be fulfilled. The meaning of the passage is clear; but both the insertion of αὐτοὶ

see below how the thread which was thus quite afresh connected is further carried on. But if the courage and the proud expectation of the Judeans were thus raised in a wholly new way by such causes, the Christians had in many respects the more to fear for themselves; and we can well understand why our author should at this period feel on that account called upon to take up his pen.

If, however, there had still been living in this wholly altered age many great apostles or other teachers of repute from the primitive times of the Church, our author would scarcely have ventured to speak so publicly to his contemporaries as the actual necessities seemed to require; but he indicates clearly enough that those great men were generally gone,[1] while he himself cannot boast of an illustrious history of his own, and undoubtedly, like the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews,[2] belonged to the younger generation of Christians. There is generally great similarity in many respects between him and that author, but still more decidedly than the latter he addresses himself to the widest circle of Christian readers, only just at the beginning and the end, where it was customary in an epistle, placing himself in any close relation with his readers, as if he had himself shortly before visited them and rejoiced at their Christian life and fellowship, and this only in the most general terms.[3] He does not write at all in the name of an earlier teacher of reputation, nor does he distantly imitate the

before καὶ and the omission of the preceding γίνεται appear to me simply two mistakes of the *Sin.*, as they damage the sense as well as the breathless flow of the language, and in general the readings of this MS. are not everywhere to be accepted.

It will appear generally from the above how far I now [1868] fix somewhat more definitely than in the first edition of this work [1859], or in my *Johanneische Schriften*, ii. p. 394, the date of this epistle. We might now also suppose that the words cap. xii. λέγει Κύριος . . . καὶ ὅταν ἐκ ξύλου αἷμα στάξῃ were taken direct from 4 Ezra v. 5; but the previous clause with ὅταν, which is evidently not less original, makes it probable that both authors are here following an earlier work. Eusebius also speaks of stones weeping blood in his work *On the Martyrs of Palestine*, now published in Syriac, p. 35.

[1] The remark of the author cap. v. comp. cap. viii. with regard to the Twelve does not show that he knew them personally; and when he speaks of them here before their call as ὄντες ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομώτεροι, it is evident that he takes such a view of them simply from the words which he here quotes from Matt. ix. 13.

[2] Vol. vii. pp. 476 sq.

[3] From capp. i. and xxi. it is quite impossible to discover any personal acquaintance of the author with his readers, although at the beginning he addresses them as *sons and daughters*, but afterwards always as *brethren* only. The sentences cap. i. are, it is true, much fuller in the Greek text than in the old Latin translation; the words 'profoundly affected me the longed-for sight of you' are found in it. But even then the readers are only in a very general way referred to; and although nothing prevents us from supposing that the author had actually visited recently the church to which he immediately sent the epistle, he still writes much more than the author of the Hebrews in such a way that his letter may throughout be equally intended for any church whatsoever.

epistles of Paul, but he adheres much more to the general line of thought of James the Just or Peter, whilst as regards the great Christian ideas he also remains in complete harmony with Paul. But he was plainly not desirous that his epistle should be published in his own name, probably simply on account of the great insecurity in which all Christians were then living in those countries. Thus we have here the new phenomenon of a younger Christian of this second age choosing the customary outward literary form of an epistle, simply that under cover of it he might the more easily address all Christian readers in the world at large. A later reader, probably simply because the author shows essential agreement with Paul's ideas, though never any imitation of his language, ascribed the epistle to Barnabas,[1] the older and independent companion of the Apostle, a suggestion in which he may have been influenced by the recollection that Barnabas according to early tradition was labouring at last in Egypt,[2] for it was probably also an early reminiscence that this epistle was written from Egypt. It will probably always remain impossible to discover the name of the real author.

As a fact, everything which our author wishes to communicate to the wide circle of his readers is such as would not be occasioned by anything like questions addressed to him, or by any special ties by which he was connected with individuals or churches, but is only of the most general signification, and what was so deeply needed by that new age. Indeed, he in reality proposes simply to communicate in this way various elements of a deeper knowledge and wisdom which he has recently discovered, and which was then already commonly called *Gnosis*.[3] In three directions this deeper insight is to show itself. In the first instance, in relation to the times: it is needful to perceive what time it is now both in the kingdom of this world[4] and in the kingdom of God; how, according to the ancient prophecies concerning Christ, *life*, *faith*, *hope*, as the three Divinely fixed principles, are *the beginning and end* of Christians, whilst *love, joy, and the witnesses of glad works in righteousness*

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 338 sq.

[2] Clement, *Hom.* i. 8, 9. Even in this unhistorical book he could not have been represented as in Alexandria unless some early tradition to that effect had been in existence. This probability is supported by the fact that Barnabas is held in great honour by Clement of Alexandria.

[3] Our author says himself cap. i. that he will only *briefly write* (κατὰ μικρὸν ὑμῖν πέμψαι, as δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα, 1 Pet. v. 12) to his readers *that they may have along with faith Gnosis in full measure*. In cap. ii. again, Gnosis appears at the beginning as the eighth and last member after the seven other spiritual attainments; and so it is with it throughout the whole epistle.

[4] According to the passage from Daniel, cap. iv., which closes therefore with *intelligere ergo debemus*.

are *the beginning and end* of their justification at the judgment; how, that is, the *beginning* of the fulfilment came with Christ, and how the *consummation* will surely come.[1] But the author does not go more particularly into all this, which would of itself make a complete Apocalypse, inasmuch as he wishes, secondly, to show especially how according to this profounder knowledge everything that is eternal and Divine in the Old Testament remains perpetuated in its true Christian sense in the New Testament, how the *new Law* of Christ is at the same time the true ancient Law of Moses,[2] that the Temple is perpetuated in the true Christian Church,[3] that the sacrifices of the Old Testament,[4] the fasts,[5] circumcision and the laws concerning food,[6] as well as the Sabbath,[7] are all retained in the Christian Church, and, indeed, first receive there their purely spiritual, and therefore eternal, significance. In this respect our author simply carries out further what the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews had begun,[8] though without taking him as a pattern, and, indeed, probably without knowing him; and after the fall of the Temple it was much more necessary to teach all this. But, thirdly, our author introduces a great deal of new deeper insight with reference to the art of allegorically transferring all that is written in the Old Testament to Christ and Christianity; he supplies a number of important illustrations of this art as practised by him, and imagines that in these arts of interpretation especially he can give his readers very much that is new and interesting.[9]

These three points are presented to the reader very much mixed up together; and, as the chief matters upon which the author laid the greatest weight, constitute by far the largest portion of the epistle. But as he may well have perceived that new deep wisdom of this kind, although very attractive to many readers, in conformity with the taste, and to some extent

[1] This chief matter receiving prominence at the very beginning, cap. i., and being afterwards referred to incidentally; comp. as to the *consummation* capp. xv. xvii. xxi. But the ancient Latin translation is here again very obscure and imperfect; following the Greek text, with some emendations, we must read: *τρία οὖν δόγματά ἐστιν κυρίου ζωὴ πίστις ἐλπὶς ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ἡμῶν· καὶ δικαιοσύνης κρίσεως ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ἀγάπη εὐφροσύνη καὶ ἀγαλλιάσεως ἔργων ἐν δικαιοσύῃ μαρτύρια.* We see from this instance also how fond our author is of round numbers.

[2] Especially capp. ii. and iv. in agreement with the Epistle of James.

[3] Our author lays great weight capp. iv. vi. xvi. on the fact that Christians themselves are now the *ναὸς θεοῦ*, like the writer whose words are now quoted 2 Cor. vi. 16 (see *Jahrbb. d. Bibl. Wiss.* ix. p. 216).

[4] Especially capp. ii. vii. viii.

[5] Capp. iii. vii.

[6] Capp. ix. x.

[7] Cap. xv., comp. the remarks vol. vii. p. 125, on the Christian Sunday.

[8] See vol. vi. pp. 477 sq.

[9] We find this throughout the whole of the chief portion of his epistle, from cap. ii. to cap. xvi.

the wants, of the time, was nevertheless little adapted to instruct the multitude of his readers with sufficient clearness and to their edification, he himself introduced a change in the style of his epistle at the end, as if he desired to supply something which he could not well wholly omit. As in a second portion of his book, he supplies therefore a summary of all the chief duties which a Christian must practise,[1] and of the worst vices which he must avoid,[2] and then closes his work[3] with a reference to the certain and near approach of the last day of judgment, and with a few further exhortations appropriate to that thought. It is therefore as if no Christian epistle could as yet be published without some exhortations easily intelligible to the simplest and most uneducated members of the Church, or without some reference at the end to the nearness of the day of judgment; and though the exhortations which our author thus gives at the end must, from the plan of his book, be as short as possible, they are still the best, clearest, and most needful that could very well be published in such a brief compass. And this collection of fine sayings, as they here appear for the first time in a Christian Book of Proverbs, might of themselves secure for his epistle a good reception, and zealous readers at all events for a considerable time.

The anonymous author connects this second and much shorter half of his book with the former and larger half and its principal purpose by describing it as supplying a second kind of *Gnosis*, or profounder insight and doctrine,[4] that is, a more popular gnosis, referring immediately to the numerous duties of life, Christianity as it then was in the world being, in fact, itself deeper knowledge and doctrine as compared with Heathenism. If it had been his aim to include all the wants of the Christian Church of this age, he might have given his readers a *Gnosis* with regard to Christian hope, as it required then to be reshaped in many respects, and thus have added a third general section to his book. But he himself felt how difficult it was to reconstruct the various elements of this great hope as it had prevailed till then so as to make it perhaps more suitable to the new age. This new age was itself then too undeveloped, and the author was unwilling to approach with his art and allegory the *Parables*, in which that hope seemed to him still to lie; as he is sincere enough to confess.[5]

[1] Capp. xviii–xix.
[2] Cap. xx.
[3] Cap. xxi.
[4] Cap. xviii., ἑτέρα γνῶσις καὶ διδαχή, comp. cap. i.
[5] διὰ τὸ (τὰ μέλλοντα) ἐν παραβολαῖς κτεῖσθαι, cap. xvii. By these *Parables* the author means probably those of Christ concerning the future of the kingdom of God especially, Matt. xiii., as well as

The Dangers and the Errors connected with the Use of Allegory in the Church.

This general epistle, or pamphlet, which we are now accustomed to speak of as the Epistle of Barnabas, presented therefore, after the occurrence of the great revolutionary change of the period, the first tolerably complete picture of the life which Christians had then to lead in the world, particularly in view of the cessation of the supremacy of the Judean Temple. And how much did it contain that is perfectly true and a continuation of the principles of the perfect true religion! At the same time, it is impossible not to see that, in spite of the wide circulation which it must have met with at one time, it falls into an error which, if it had once obtained the upper hand, would have been most disastrous as regards all sound life and vigorous progress in the early Church, and have now at once thrown it back again into that turbid stream which had contributed in no small degree to the destruction of Judeanism then proceeding.

A better name for this book than the Epistle of Barnabas would be the *Gnosis Epistle*: it is the first book (enjoying for a time in certain circles a great popularity) which, on the basis of an otherwise healthy and genuine Christianity, recommends *gnosis* and inaugurates it not unskilfully. Now, it is true that gnosis, i.e. knowledge or insight, is something indispensable; and when it denotes, as was then the case in the early Church, the truly Christian *sophia*, or philosophy, in contrast with a philosophy which had been formed mainly under Heathen influences, nothing can be said against it. As Christianity had brought into the world a fundamental view of true salvation differing essentially from every Heathen and very much from the Judean view then in vogue, there was involved in it from the very first a rich number of new conceptions, which at the time of their first appearance could hardly be spoken of in terms of too great profundity and mystery, and which, as rising in full vigour from the bosom of their age, necessarily bore its brightest colours. Just now, after the great revolution of the age, a new and growing variety of forms of such gnosis came to light, the circumstances then first favouring their growth: and when our Gnosis Epistle so emphatically teaches that the Christian Church is the true temple of God,[1] this looks like

others which he found elsewhere in the Scriptures or in the oral traditions of Christ's words.

[1] See *ante*, p. 112.

an utterance of surprisingly profound, or, indeed, at first sight, of enigmatical wisdom, and, though clothed in the colours of the age and intended primarily only for the period of the recently vanished Judean Temple, it is still perfectly true. But the very fact that our author writes his book mainly with the view of discovering and propagating such outlines of a new and profounder knowledge, indicates an artificial rather than a pure and thoroughly genuine aim, which could, therefore, of itself yield but little good fruit. A passion for obtaining and publishing such new and profound light on questions of religion had at that time long been common in the Judean schools; and after the destruction of Jerusalem especially, in consequence of the new zeal with which the schools sought to defend everything that was Judean, received a fresh impulse, as we saw above.[1] It is as if our author desired to rival these schools and to show that it is in Christianity only that the true gnosis is to be found. We may call this the *learned* or *scholastic gnosis*; and from this time forth the word, in itself so harmless, receives more and more its bad secondary meaning. This gnosis is in our book already at work in all its essential varieties: we meet even with the construction of artificial systems by means of pretty combinations of certain spiritual powers in round numbers,[2] which is subsequently repeated in the case of the ordinary Gnostics without end. But it is especially one kind of gnosis which our author cultivates with peculiar delight, and indeed with a certain proud conceit of his new skill and power of invention,[3] and it is in it particularly that the dangers and seductions which attend the Scholastic Gnosis generally appear.

We refer to the art of interpreting allegorically the Scriptures, which in the case of our author are still the writings of the Old Testament only.[4] Philo had brought this art to great perfection in his various books,[5] and in the Judean schools subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem it only flourished more luxuriantly. As it had long lain in the air of these cen-

[1] *Ante*, p. 43.

[2] E.g. when our author cap. ii. proposes two assistants of Christian faith *φόβος* and *ὑπομονή*, two fellow-combatants *μακροθυμία* and *ἐγκράτεια*, and as the glad attendants of these four the three *σοφία*, *σύνεσις*, *ἐπιστήμη*, with *γνῶσις* as the eighth power added to those seven; or when, according to p. 113, he distinguishes between a higher and a lower gnosis.

[3] Comp. the statement, 'No one learnt from me a more genuine doctrine (in which allegory was more perfectly and better exhibited than here); but I know that ye are worthy of it (to hear such allegorical philosophy),' cap. ix. *ad fin.*

[4] His book contains numerous re-echoes of the Gospels (not excepting that of John), but it is only cap. iv. that the saying 'many called, few chosen,' is once introduced with *καθὼς γέγραπται*, and there is no difficulty in supposing that the Collected Sayings, which had then long become practically canonical, is referred to.

[5] See vol. vii. pp. 219 sq.

turies, though it finds no place in the discourses and teaching of Christ himself,[1] this art is met with in the speeches and epistles of Paul, who had been educated in the schools. Yet in Paul's case it occurs but rarely, is used with great moderation, and chiefly only when it is his aim to rival his Judean and learned opponents.[2] But as Philo's writings became more and more widely circulated and eagerly read, we then see the author of the so-called Epistle to the Hebrews first applying allegory more frequently and freely. Our author, however, goes beyond him in this respect, for in the chief portion of his epistle he hunts after allegories with great zest and is proud of the ingenious fancies which he captures, as if this accomplishment also had now been wrested in its highest application from the Judean schools and Christianised. We find therefore in his book all the technical kinds of allegory that are at all possible;[3] and in reality the entire Old Testament, not excepting its most concrete portions, such as the Mosaic laws regarding food, can accordingly only be allegorised, that is, explained away, as soon as ingenuity enough is acquired to dissolve the various resisting materials by the aid of the idea that these laws cannot be meant literally.[4] It might, therefore, appear as if the laws of the Old Testament regarding food lost their validity in the case of Christians solely because their ordinary meaning could be exalted into a higher sphere by the aid of such ingenious fancies. But the entire historical, that is, original and real, meaning of the Old Testament would thereby be explained away, and Christian learning, or, indeed, Christianity itself, to the extent to which it is made to rest on that learning, would become really nothing more than another form of Philonic philosophy. We should then at last not only enter a region accessible and intelligible to the scholar only, but we should in reality slide back into the Judean spirit of these last days and lose the sacred Scriptures themselves by explaining away their

[1] See vol. vi. pp. 217, 233 sq. For utterances of the Glorified Christ might according to Luke xxiv. 44–47 be supposed to be of this character, as, in fact, subsequently appears in the great example of the *Pistis Sophia*, which was published in the Coptic, 1851 (London). But utterances of this kind must be carefully distinguished from those of the living visible Christ, and are here in Luke even only indicated in as general a way as possible.

[2] Hence especially in the Epistle to the Galatians.

[3] E.g. when in connection with the question as to the meaning of circumcision, cap. ix., which, according to Gen. xvii., Abraham's slaves had to undergo, the number of 318 slaves is taken from xiv. 14, and it is inferred from the numerical value of 'Π' or ιη, 18, that Ἰησούς, and from Π = 300, that the Cross, as the ancient symbolic meaning of T, were meant, and that therefore circumcision according *to the Divine intention* ('this he knows who placed the genuine gift of the doctrine in us') can refer only to faith in the Crucified One.

[4] Cap. x. with its elaborate expositions.

substantial meaning. And when an art of this kind is used as a weapon against the ancient Community. as is the habit of our author, an injustice is done to it even; the bad weapon which was wrested from that Community is only turned against it; and the liberty is at the same time taken of interpreting its Old Testament unfairly.

It is remarkable that this false and dangerous course is taken as soon as the Christian Church feels itself quite free from the yoke of the Judean school, and thus the Church in this very freedom attempts to rival the Synagogue, as if the learned arts which flourished in the latter must now become more serviceable to the new Christian spirit. We can, therefore, at this point already surmise how easily the full freedom that had been won in this direction might prove dangerous to true Christian life at a time when it had not been fully enough developed nor its true relations to the new world established. It is also well known how irresistibly this diseased form of Biblical interpretation generally, and, indeed, of all human thought and speech, soon crept in again amongst Christian scholars; how, contrary to the example of Christ himself, it spread more and more in the Christian Church, and remained in force throughout the entire Middle Ages, and what hurtful effects it then gradually produced in an increasingly painful form. But this being so, it is the more important at this point to carefully observe how little this form of interpretation is recommended by the example and the inclination of the finest Christian minds and most distinguished writers that were labouring at this very period when its influence was for the first time strongly felt within the Christian Church. For there is nothing of greater importance in this respect than that the Apostle John in his writings keeps quite aloof from it, as we shall soon see more particularly; in this also he is the truest disciple and follower of Christ. The author of the most powerful and noble epistle next to those in the New Testament, the epistle to Diognetus, likewise makes no use of it; nor is it met with in the suggestive book *Octavius* by Minucius Felix. It is true, these two books were not addressed to Christians alone, but were meant for the whole world: a sign that the art of allegorising the Scriptures was one available only in the case of readers and hearers of a special degree of education. But as in other respects the real subject-matter of both kinds of books is the same, it appears the more clearly that this peculiar art is strictly speaking not at all a necessity, and may be dispensed with without any loss; that it was taken up, therefore,

only as a means by which a certain aim of teaching could be reached by the shortest and easiest way according to the established scholarship of those days.

2. *Retrogression in various respects, and Resistance to it.*

But the larger number of permanent views had to be won by severe conflicts with quite new endeavours which can only be regarded as retrogressive in relation to the truths which had already been clearly ascertained. Whenever such an unusual number of higher and eternal truths have been permanently reached as was now actually the case in the Christian Church, new movements are generally pregnant with retrogressive opinions only, since they seek to meet certain perceptible wants of the time, but take up improper means for the purpose, and are not careful enough to avoid old and new errors. If they still persist, perhaps because the period accidentally allows them unusual freedom, in the pursuit of their objects, they hit upon views and doctrines which for the moment appear very attractive, and perhaps lead many astray, but which after all only involve retrogression and cause confusion, or at best can only in the end involuntarily serve to promote the clearer perception and more general adoption of truths opposed to them. An instance of the ease with which erroneous aims may find their way into the Christian Church even we have met with in the use of allegory,[1] though that error was one that had long been a danger. And wholly new and much more dangerous ideas and tendencies of this kind now acquired influence; and we must now note the way in which true Christianity opposed them.

The fullest freedom for wholly new efforts of this kind had now been supplied in the Christian Church.[2] Not only the Christian churches but also the parties which, taking the ancient religion as their basis, had still kept up a connection, though it might be a loose one, with the Temple, acquired now, by its destruction, suddenly a freedom such as they had hitherto not known to attempt whatever they were able. On all hands the dissenting parties which had been kept down or at all events in check by the proud and powerful Hagiocracy in Jerusalem now breathed more freely; and as the time was generally one of enthusiastic excitement for them, inasmuch as it encouraged all those who had held more aloof from the Hagiocracy to attempt at this favourable moment whatever

[1] *Ante*, pp. 115 sq.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 6 sq.

they could in the good cause, we see a number of new religious creations rapidly springing up, and all of them, as far as they did not lay hold of the great truths embodied in Christianity and in the lesson of the age, caused confusion simply and did greatest injury to the truer form of Christianity. The period soon becomes thereby only too agitated; and the more genuine form of Christianity, which was based on truer perception and doctrine, was called upon first in this connection to show itself equal to the trial.

(*a*) *The renewed Movements of the Disciples of the Baptist.—Elkcsái.*

Next to Christianity there was no movement that had a more powerful inward tendency to assume at this favourable period a new form than that of the disciples of the Baptist; and as Christianity had in a certain respect proceeded from the movement of the Baptist, the mutual relations between the two movements had continued intimate. Although we have no express account to that effect, there can be no doubt but that the movement of the Baptist was at this time revived. True disciples of the Baptist, who after their master's death refused to hear anything about Christianity, but sought to form themselves more and more exclusively into parties representing one or the other of his ideas, were to be found in the Apostolic age, at all events here and there.[1] Yet we do not know that they then formed new and considerable churches. But now, when all parties that had felt the pressure of the yoke of the Temple enjoyed larger freedom, these followers of the Baptist must have reorganised themselves and commenced a movement of serious rivalry with the Christian Church. It follows plainly enough from the writings of the Apostle John that they enjoyed quite a revival about this time, for the Apostle alludes in several passages, not without a purpose, to the claims of these later disciples of the Baptist.[2] So that we must have accepted it as historically attested, if we had been unable otherwise to authenticate the conclusion. But, as a fact, we are able to do this.

The second Sibylline poem comes to our assistance on this point.[3] The poem was written about the year 80, and, like the

[1] See vol. vii. pp. 136, 390.

[2] With regard to the references in his Gospel, see *Jahrbb. d. B. W.* iii. pp. 156 sq.; in his epistles the express and emphatically repeated remark that Christ came not *by water* alone, I. v. 6–8, contains a perceptible allusion to the followers of the Baptist of those days. Comp. my *Johanneische Schriften*, i. pp. 13 sq.

[3] See in general my *Abhandlung* on these poems (Göttingen, 1858), pp. 44–51.

Epistle of Barnabas, alludes in the most vivid way to the destruction, then complete, of the Temple and also to its superfluity.[1] Like the writings of John just referred to, it was written in Asia Minor, and therefore in the locality in which, according to the writings of John, we must suppose the revival of the Baptist's followers occurred. This entire poem, moreover, was written by one of their number, and enables us to obtain a view of the internal condition of this religious sect at that time.

According to what we find in this poem, the followers of the Baptist and the Essenes had then undergone some amalgamation, and from the combination of the two sects a new organisation or society had been produced, which, as one of the most recent creations of the kind, displayed just then unusual activity. An amalgamation of this kind need not surprise us. For, on the one hand, the movement of the Baptist had from the first shown close affinity to Essenism,[2] although his was a perfectly independent and original movement. On the other hand, the Essenes must at that time have been fully aroused from their earlier repose; though their connection with the Temple was always loose, it was now entirely ended, and we shall soon see that they gradually became absorbed into other societies. The movement of the Baptist claimed to be the mother of Christianity, and, indeed, to surpass it in profound earnestness and purity of life: Essenism was still rude and stern enough, and might in so far once more come to terms with that movement as one of its own offshoots; but it lacked the living Messianic expectation of the latter, and suffered, moreover, under a morbid tendency towards solitude and celibacy. Accordingly both sects exchanged with each other their most important principles and practices; constant bathing, repeated daily early in the morning,[3] was to take the place of the Temple as a means of purification, profound penances were to be combined with the most earnest dread of the near day of judgment; and whilst the new society, in opposition to the tendencies of Essenism, allowed marriage and full participation in the affairs of the world, it still retained from the Essenes the name of *the Devout*.[4] All who did not belong to their circle

[1] See *Sib.* iv. 6–17, 27–30, 116, 118, 125–127.

[2] See vol. vi. p. 168.

[3] Hence they are called in the Talmudic writings טוֹבְלֵי שַׁחֲרִית, *morning bathers*; and they appear in these writings, not as Christians, but only as people who claim to be more pious than the Pharisees: see Toseph. to M. Jadaim iv. 8.

[4] As follows from the very characteristic language of the Sibyl, see my *Abhandlung*, p. 46; no other name recurs so constantly as εὐσεβής, i.e. חסיד, Ἐσσαῖος for a member of this Community,

were regarded as the ungodly. But while they thus opposed all other parties and churches, whether composed of Heathen or not, with their new and fierce zeal, they soon had to find out that the outside world could meet them with more terrible bitterness.[1] But the poem of the Sibyl, which came from their midst, is a permanent witness to the large amount of profound feeling and conscientious pious endeavour to be found amongst them, and shows how powerfully they confronted at that time the whole world with their bold thoughts and words. Nor can we fail to see that a still more vigorous party subsequently started from them with a new amalgamation of Christian influences. But about the year 80 the party still retained its first simple character, and does not appear to have extended far beyond Asia Minor. We are able also to give the usual Greek name of these people: they were called *Hemerobaptists*, or Daily-Baptists, a name which sufficiently distinguished them from Christians.[2]

The most decisive mark of the powerful impression which baptism made after it had received its great significance from the Baptist and Christ, even against its own wish, upon the ancient Community, is that it is now by many Rabbis made the condition of entrance into the Judean Community. That it was thus required by them in the period before us and long afterwards cannot be doubted,[3] and the cause is not far to seek. As with the destruction of the Temple so many ceremonies had now to be discontinued, the want of new ones was naturally felt, and it was prudent to borrow some from Christianity, which was now becoming so powerful, as a means of counteracting its charm. We saw above another instance of this,[4] and baptism was the more suitable as it could be used in the case of women also. In their case, therefore, it was to supply the

comp. lines 26, 35, 42, 44, 45, 117, 136, 152, 155, 166, 169, 170, 183, 186, 189, and as a synonyme ὅσιος, lines 23, 153. The use of the latter name explains how Greek authors could afterwards use the paronomasia Ὀσσαῖοι instead of Ἐσσαῖοι, Epiph. *Hær.* 19.

[1] See especially *Sib.* iv. 35–39, 152–156.

[2] It follows from the enumeration of seven non-Christian sects in Hegesippus (Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 22) that the Hemerobaptists kept apart from Christianity: in the *Const. Apost.* vi. 6. half of their peculiarities are described simply according to Mark vii. 3, and by Epiphanius they are even classed together with the Pharisees and Sadducees, *Hær.* xvii. We see from this simply that their true peculiarities were early forgotten, namely as soon as the Elkesaites arose, who pursued their aims more vigorously. And when John himself is called a Hemerobaptist, *Clem. Hom.* ii. 23, we have simply a later confusion.

[3] See, for instance, especially the *Massêcheth Gêrîm* of the Jerusalem Talmud, published in the *Septem libri Talmudici parvi Hierosolymitani* of Gaph. Kirchheim, Frankf. a. M. 1851, capp. 1, 2, pp. 38–40; in this tract all that concerns this point is most clearly set forth. Further, comp. especially the *G.* on *Abod z sara*, iv. 9.

[4] *Ante*, p. 31.

place of circumcision, and in that of men to precede it. The sacrifice which the applicant for admission had to bring according to ancient custom, and by which he first became an actual and full member of the Community, was to be retained as far as practicable, but a money-offering might easily be substituted for it.

It can, therefore, create no surprise that at length a new form of the amalgamation with Christianity of this exaggeration of baptism in the sect just described was attempted, and that thus a hybrid movement arose, which, as proceeding from a new idea, became the most marked and vigorous of all these new creations, inasmuch as it sought also to combine into a new whole the two related and most vigorous formations of the entire past period, and into a whole which seemed, as being an advance upon both, to be their perfect development. We refer to the society which was founded by a certain Elchasáih, with regard to which it is only recently that we have been placed in a position to bring together somewhat more complete and reliable accounts.[1] This is undoubtedly the name of the actual founder of the society, as every association with marked peculiarities always proceeds from the fundamental idea and the active labours of one teacher. The Greeks pronounced the name Elkesái, and used it so frequently that they abbreviated it into Elxái.[2] The essentially new idea in this faith was that of regarding and applying baptism as itself the chief

[1] To the accounts in Hippolytus, *Hær.* ix. 13–17, comp. iv. 10, 29, and Eusebius (from Origen), *Ecc. Hist.* vi. 38, further Epiphan. *Hær.* xix., comp. xxx. liii., Theodor. *Hær.* ii. 7 (who follows Hippol.) we can now add those found in Arabic works, which Chwolson has collected in his great work on the *Ssabier* (Petersb. 1856, comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1856, pp. 1913 sq.); a Sibylline book also has been discovered which is an important document regarding this sect: see below.

[2] The orthography 'Ηλχασαΐ in Hippol. is the earliest Greek form, but Eusebius has already' Ελκεσαΐ and Epiphan. 'Ηλξαΐ. As Epiphan. xix. 2 explains the name by δύναμις κεκαλυμμένη, it was supposed to be derived from חֵיל כְּסִי, and was taken to be that of an angel or even of a book. But now that the proper name has recently been discovered in the Arabic form as الحسيح, all those modern and ancient fancies have been put an end to; even Epiphanius no longer understood the name therefore, and probably met with it only in Greek characters. We must allow that it is difficult to find the original meaning of this name. It is evident that the *el* with which the Arabic name begins is not the Arabic article; the word bears upon it no mark of an Arabic origin, and it is pretty certain that these Arabs met with it originally in Syriac books; a supposition which explains their orthography with two *ḥ*'s, whilst in Aramaic the first ח might have a rougher sound. Now, as Elchasáih had, according to Epiphan. xix. 1, a brother 'Ιεξαΐ, we may with greatest probability suppose that the two proper names in Hebrew-Aramaic were אֶלְחֲשַׁיִח יֶחְשַׁיִח, the latter formed according to *LB.* § 108 *c*, with some such meaning as *fit for God*, comp. ܝܚܫܝܚ, a diminutive form of the adjective. No historical inference may be drawn from the merely rhetorical expression ἡ κενὴ ἐπιδημία τοῦ ξένου δαίμονος 'Ηλχασαΐ in Hippolytus ix. 4.

means of human salvation, with the purpose of thereby leaving Christianity behind it as remaining upon a lower stage though it had advanced beyond the Baptist. Baptism was, therefore, regarded by this sect not as one of the sacraments, or as the entrance into the kingdom of God and dedication to its membership, with its sacrifice as the frequently repeated and most powerful means of grace, but it was the sole sacrament and itself the highest sacrifice, and therefore capable of repetition as often as might appear suitable or needful. The transition to this extreme development of Baptist tendencies was evidently made by the school of the Hemerobaptists, but it was the Elcesaites who first forced baptism, and remission of sins as necessarily connected with it, to take the rank of the absolutely highest remedy for every evil. Even those who were suffering from any bodily or mental evil of any kind, and also the most unjust and abandoned of men, might be saved by it, and not even on condition that they should not so sin again, but as often as anyone felt himself to be a sinner or a sufferer, or was acknowledged to be such. Now, as it was impossible that all this should be found in baptism itself, it followed most naturally that Elchasáih was compelled to resort to a multitude of arbitrary suppositions and additional measures in order to secure for baptism this supreme importance and virtue. He propounded a doctrine regarding all things in the world to the effect that everything had been created either masculine or feminine, or, at all events, had so grown,[1] and that there were certain times and stars of ill omen, as the Chaldean astrologers taught.[2] This gave him the means of distinguishing strictly between things pure and impure in the world and in the realm of spirits, and of setting up an ethical system on this distinction. But as he suffered under the general disease of that time of classifying everything under sacred numbers, he put forward, for instance, seven most sacred things by which men must swear as by witnesses (heaven, water, the holy spirits, the angels of prayer; oil, salt, and earth), and seven kinds of sins (adultery, theft, injustice, taking advantage, hatred, denial, and all the rest).[3] Sacred words, used in a prescribed order and meaning,

[1] According to el-Nadîm's *Fihrist* in Chwolson ii. p. 543; but it by no means follows from this that Elchasáih taught a dualistic system as regards the world generally, to the effect that all things were created good or evil, as was subsequently the case with Mani: of this there is no trace with regard to Elchasáih. On the contrary, it is expressly stated that he received the God taught in the Bible; and we must leave to the later Mani what belongs to him.

[2] Hippolytus ix. 16.

[3] Hipp. ix. 15 and other accounts; we can easily see from this that the seven witnesses are divided again into four and three, the last three being στοιχεῖα; but the oil is evidently taken from Chris-

were to be employed at all times as incantations, and the invocation of the 'Most High God' was to accompany everything, a practice which he borrowed from the school of the Judean magicians.[1] Above all he deified water, and thus placed it in opposition to fire and the corresponding earlier Temple sacrifices; and baptism itself is often ordered to be performed with the clothes on. But as he thus introduced the Chaldaic-Judean superstitions of his time in a cruder form than ever, if possible, and proceeded from an entirely false principle, he could not, when he proposed to acknowledge and make use of Christianity, arrive at any true knowledge or application of it. Thus he taught that Christ had only at last appeared in that definite form as a man, but had previously appeared in other bodies and would in the future often so appear again. At the same time he insisted on the acknowledgment of the ancient Law, even with its circumcision and Sabbath, while, on the other hand, he prohibited animal sacrifices, and, after the manner of the Essenes, the eating even of flesh. But he laid greater stress than the Hemerobaptists upon marriage,[2] in that respect exhibiting marked opposition to a tendency which was about to become here and there more prevalent in the Christian Church,[3] and subsequently inflicted increasing injury upon it. From these peculiarities we can understand his rejection of the Apostle Paul,[4] and no party contributed more in the East than his to the misunderstanding and depreciation of Paul.[5] And as he propounded so much that was purely arbitrary, we can well understand why he should make a distinction between full and partial members, or between the holders of the exoteric and esoteric doctrine; the latter he called the Pious, or also the Baptists, the former Disciples, or also Prognostics,[6] and

tianity (see vol. vii. p. 452); water, on the contrary, is here almost deified. Comp. the seven pillars of the world, *Clem. Hom.* xviii. 14.

[1] See on this point *ante*, p. 20. Hence the Clementine Homilies everywhere represent Peter as healing the sick by prayer and the τρισμακαρία ἐπονομασία, *Clem. Hom.* ix. 19, 22, 23, comp. xi. 26, xiii. 4, xvi. 18, 19 (where the *nomen ineffabile* is once plainly mentioned). This book similarly urges *fasting*, xiii. 9, 11, 12, and the like externals; and teaches expressly that more freedom may easily lead astray, xi. 30, 33.

[2] See *ante*, p. 120.

[3] See vol vii. p. 383, and the remarks to be made below.

[4] Of which there is accidentally no mention in Hippolytus; but the other sources speak plainly on the point; and the language of the Clementines with regard to Paul is most easily explained thus.

[5] The traces of which are still to be found in the works of Wâqidi.

[6] This appears to be the most likely supposition, according to Hippolytus' accounts. Elchasâih, therefore, addressed his followers by their full names as εὐσεβεῖς καὶ μαθηταί, Hippol. ix. 16; hence according to ix. 13 he handed down his book to a certain Σοβιαί, i.e. ܨܒܝܐ, *Baptist*. The name *Pious* was accordingly retained from the Hemerobaptists (*ante*, p. 120); but that of Προγνωστικοί was evidently intended to indicate

thus simply went back in a worse way to the old Judean distinction between Levites and non-Levites. But with such a distinction between partial and full Baptists and his whole doctrine of Baptism as a perpetual remedy for even the worst future transgressions, it could readily be supposed that the baptised person, when persecuted by the world, might very well conceal or deny his true faith, if he only afterwards sought forgiveness in due time and in the acknowledged form. Thus this was the first sect after the rise of Christianity which sanctioned duplicity and hypocrisy in matters of faith [1]—a course which was afterwards common in many sects, though it was diametrically opposed to the spirit of Christianity.

The above account gives the essential features of these Baptists of Baptists, so to speak, and the sect is so remarkable because, of all the new parties of this period, it obtained greatest permanency, and a community proceeded from it which flourished to a considerable degree for centuries, and certain relics of which still exist. For it seemed to be the most logical and thorough development of the idea of baptism, which since the Baptist had obtained amongst the adherents of the true religion, and thus flattered men's pride, whilst it was only too indulgent towards even an emasculation and degeneration of the true religion. It is no less unmistakable that it originated from a Judean source than that its founder was a Judean; but the latter may have long resided in the farther East, and have been early educated in the philosophic schools which flourished there, thus borrowing much from the Chaldean or Babylonian philosophy. Elchasáih accordingly related, in the book which became the basis of the religion of his followers, that that book, with its revelations, had been given to him in the remote East (amongst the Parthian Seres, as he said) by the two highest angels, whose gigantic stature he endeavours to describe more particularly; one of them, a male, who was equal to the Son of God, and the other, a female, who was equal to the Holy Ghost.[2] Whence his followers probably said that this book had fallen from heaven. We see thus that this book of the sect was as arbitrary a creation as the sect itself, and that from the first the chief interest was producing an effect on the imagination rather than real instruction. Elchasáih maintained likewise

men of a more advanced stage than that of the ordinary Gnostics; a sign that there were Gnostics previously.

[1] E.g. amongst the Druses and similar small sects which have continued down to our own day in the Syrian countries.

[2] As was believed in many similar schools of the East, because the Semitic word רוּחַ is feminine; this is in all such cases a proof that the Greek language was unused by those parties.

that he thus received his book in the third year of Trajan (101 A.D.); elsewhere in it he speaks as if Trajan was still reigning,[1] and we have no reason for doubting that the book was actually sent out into the world at that time. We have now also a relic of the peculiar language of the earliest books of this Baptist school.[2] About the year 138 A.D. a very enthusiastic student of this doctrine sought to recommend it to the world at large by means of a Greek Sibylline work;[3] and we see from it particularly that this new sect was at first unconsciously most powerfully affected by the Christian spirit. Another attempt to recommend the aims of this school was made, in the ancient prophetic form, by the Third Book of Baruch,[4] which has come down to us in an Ethiopic translation only, and which retains only the barest outlines of the Second Book of Baruch,[5] while in other respects it claims to be Christian. For, as a matter of course, this society of Baptists was soon split up into various parties, some of them desiring to adopt more Christianity than others; and a most skilful effort to recommend the essential dogmas and practices of these Baptists was made towards the end of the second century by the author of the Clementine Homilies.[6] The original tendencies

[1] In the much corrupted passage, Hippol. ix. 16 *ad fin.*; this passage would bring us down to the time of Trajan's Parthian wars.

[2] In Epiphan. xix. 4, who has here various information derived from ancient sources. He gives the following words in Greek characters as a prayer of the sect, adding his own interpretation: Αβαρ παρελθέτω, Ανιδ ταπείνωσις, Μωιβ ἡ ἐκ πατέρων μου, Νωχιλε τῆς κατακρίσεως αὐτῶν, Δαασιμ καὶ καταπατήσεως αὐτῶν, Ανη καὶ πόνου αὐτῶν, Δαασιμ καταπατήματι, Νωχιλε ἐν κατακρίσει, Μωιβ διὰ τῶν πατέρων μου, Ανιδ ἀπὸ ταπεινώσεως, Αβαρ παρελθούσης, Σελεμ ἐγ ἀποστολῇ τελειώσεως. We see that his Greek interpretation yields no meaning and is very arbitrary; he also undoubtedly met with the Semitic in Greek characters. The probable restoration of the original is:

עבר ענית מואב נוחלי תעשם | ענה
תעשם נוחלי מואב ענית עבר | שלם

that is, 'Did the misery of Moab pass by, the diseases of their suffering? Answer! Their suffering, the diseases of Moab, the misery passed by; farewell!' In that case it is to be interpreted as a question and an answer, the delight of the sect over their bodily and spiritual salvation, since Elchasáih professed particularly to cure all kinds of diseases; and that Moab, which is so much spoken against in the Old Testament, should boast of this new honour, accords with the account that these Elcesaites were from the first resident especially in Moab and the surrounding districts. Some unusual letters, such as ס for ת, *i* for *â*, would then be explained as peculiar to the dialect of Moab. Like everything connected with Elchasáih this verse is also arbitrary and artificial, its second member repeating the same words in the reverse order. ענה is *suffering*.

[3] See my *Abhandlung*, pp. 63–70.

[4] Published in Dillmann's *Chrestom. Æth.* Leipzig, 1866 [in the Greek by Ceriani, *Mon. Sacr. et Prof.* v. i. p. 9, sq. 1868.]

[5] See *ante*, p. 57 sq.

[6] At last, in the edition *Clementis R. Homiliæ viginti*, Gött. 1853, the work appeared with greater completeness at the end, but in this edition also it is evidently defective and lacks particularly its original conclusion. We may gather to some extent the nature of the original conclusion from the *Acta Petri et Pauli* (in Tischendorf's *Acta Apocr.* pp. 7 sq.) and Abulfatch's *Ann. Samar.* pp. 158 sq. But the work is much more authentic and complete in the form of the *Homilies* than in that of the *Recognitions*, now

of these Baptists were now rigidly carried out by the new society of the Samsæans, with whom water was regarded positively as a god.[1] But all the endeavours of the sects of this class to spread themselves in the West almost totally failed,[2] whilst in the countries beyond the Jordan and far eastwards they gradually amalgamated with the Jewish Christians to be described below, and thus founded such flourishing communities that the few relics of the Ssabians—that is, of the Baptists—still to be found there supply evidence of their past strength and influence.[3] We may also form an idea of the powerful influence of these Baptist sects in Eastern countries from Manichæism, which originated in Babylon, and the cradle of which is to be found in these sects.[4]

The Apostle John, as we shall see, shows how these hangers-on of the Baptist could be best met. But before we come to him we must now consider more closely

(*b*) *The Errors which arose from the new Freedom of the Church, and also the Gnosis of the Time.*

It was, for this age, of great importance that all the energies of the new freedom which Christianity now possessed should be first put forth most unrestrainedly within its own territory, and that they should make whatever experiments seemed possible in this new period. According to the prevailing view of the Heathen world at all events, Judeanism had at last been completely overthrown, and it was not easy to anticipate a new rising of it outside its own limits; and in the years immediately preceding the destruction of Jerusalem it had aroused

preserved in Latin only. Of the ancient Eastern translations of the work the Syriac was published by De Lagarde in 1861, comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1861, pp. 1281 sqq. [Lagarde's edition of the Homilies, *Clementina*, was published Leipzig, 1865.]

[1] Epiphan. *Hær.* liii. When Epiphanius seeks to derive their name from the *sun*, as if they had been worshippers of the sun and despisers of the moon, this notion is no more than trifling. They probably took their name as *Therapeutæ* from ܦܠܚ, *to serve*, the name of the Essenes appearing in the case of other Baptist sects (see *ante*, p. 121); comp. also vol. v. p. 377.

[2] According to the passage from Origen in Euseb. and Hippolytus.

[3] This is not the place to examine the stages by which the books (still preserved, but unfortunately not all yet published) of these Ssabians, who are mentioned in the Koran, are removed from the primary book of Elchasâih; but it is in general clear that the farther these Baptists were driven eastwards the more hostile to Judeans and Christians was the form they took.

[4] Comp. *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften*, von G. Flügel, Leipzig, 1862, and my review of it in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1862, pp. 660–674.

[On both the *Ssabier* and *Mani*, their books, and their relation to Judeans and Christians, see now the articles *Mandäer* and *Mani and Manichäer* by K. Kessler, in the 2nd ed. of Herzog's *Encyclopædie* (1881).]

against it, amongst the Heathen in Egypt, in Syria, and everywhere else, too much offence, ill-will, and hostility to admit now of any other feeling amongst Christians than one of relief from great oppression. The parent Christian Church at Jerusalem had also been scattered, and, although gradually (as we shall see) seeking to collect itself again, it could in reality never regain its former preponderating influence: in this way a new unhindered course was opened to Christian freedom such as Paul had striven for and partly secured. As Christianity now came forth victoriously and confidently from the great time of trial and had to contend less with more powerful rivals, Heathen adopted it more readily in growing numbers. Now for the first time the old religion appeared to belong completely to the past, and a new one, full of power and influence, seemed to arise, which was in exclusive possession of the truth and salvation; and it was adopted with great eagerness by large numbers. At the same time many supposed that they were capable of contributing their share in the development, or, indeed, in the creation, of a cause which was still so new and so far from being permanently organised, and which now for the first time seemed destined to realise its full possibilities. This supposition was the more natural as the original and ablest founders of the new cause were no longer living, and many of them were principally known only by a few small books. Thus a combination of influences led to the inauguration of a new line of action, which was very different from that prevailingly followed in the previous Apostolic age, and which was even more wonderful than the latter for the extent of its power over the most dissimilar minds. These combined influences were—the mighty impulse which Christianity, as something previously wholly unheard of, continued to give, its own marvellously elevating and inspiring truth, the freshness of a new age just delivered from every earlier yoke, and the requirement of a complete constructive development of the new religion. It was here that the distinctive effort and the most earnest conflict of this age arose. For whilst Christianity was endeavouring with so much wholly fresh vigour and such new and unusual independence to bring under its influence minds of most varied nature in the world at large, and was straining every energy to develop itself to the full extent in the first more definite shape in which its existence in the world was then possible, the greatest errors and most dangerous courses, in which it might easily be wholly lost, were only too naturally open to it.

This was not the time, however, for at once reforming the whole system of human government, in conformity with the highest principles of Christianity, and for acting a great part in the eyes of the world with their aid. For this Christianity was as yet far too little acknowledged by the governments, and Christians might be content if they were not severely persecuted by them. The new freedom, therefore, was mainly employed in the work of learning to understand Christianity as the great new philosophy, of comprehending properly the world and Christian duties by the aid of its conceptions, and of making it, in some given sense or for some given purpose, a subject of doctrinal teaching. But all religious doctrine was then too closely connected with human life and duty to suffer it to remain without immediate influence on morality. From the very first, it is true, Christianity had been, in one aspect of it, a definite religious view and doctrine; and as it now sought, mainly in this aspect of it alone, to develop itself clearly and definitely in the new world, it coincided in this endeavour with contemporary Judeanism,[1] although not like the latter from fear of another movement and as taught by greatest calamities, but in order to establish itself in the world and acquire a preliminary developed form at least in this one most necessary aspect of it. And amongst the Samaritans also there was contemporaneously a powerful movement of a similar character;[2] and we must never leave out of sight this simultaneous and general endeavour among all the chief communities which sprang from ancient Israel. Moreover, in consequence of the wholly new character and commotion of those days, these communities always influenced each other powerfully, and the Christian Community, as the most recent and most active, in no small degree urged on the others.

But so far as it had then generally been pursued, and to a high degree of development in its way, all theological and religious science suffered under great defects. It lacked the historical sense: instead of first taking pains to accurately examine details, it always abandoned itself too quickly to the exercise of the imagination merely; and wherever this faculty had freer scope, it endeavoured, after the prevailing Zarathustrian method,[3] to reduce all ideas under similar relations and round numbers. If the scholars who now sought to give to the new Christian materials a scientific form had taken pains first to become truly Christian themselves in theological learning also—that is, finally to accept nothing in detail or in general without the certainty

[1] *Ante*, pp. 27 sq. [2] *Ante*, pp. 81 sq. [3] Vol. v. pp. 183 sq.

and joyous light of Divine knowledge—they would have been able everywhere to produce more permanent results. But whilst they looked upon the words of Christ in the Gospels, or even of Paul in his epistles, as the materials of their science, it was the scientific method of a Philo, for instance, as we have described it,[1] or of Heathen philosophers, which was before them as their model. Thus there now grew up with surprising rapidity an almost countless number of Christian schools of theology, extremely dissimilar as regards their founders, the countries where they arose, and the principles which they followed, the one seeking to surpass or to improve on the other, but all alike in so far that, while taking Christianity as their basis, they sought to teach new and profounder views of the great matters of religion. The zeal which had been once fired in this way soon knew no bounds, everything new appearing in this work admirable, and the attraction being so great to treat all the great matters of religion from the Christian standpoint in new and luminous relations. But the bare construction of even the most aerial systems of thought thus easily became the principal object; the search for and discovery of dazzling propositions or of detached and partial truths degenerated into an idle play of the imagination, or even into an object of a vain love of victory and obstinate contention. Whilst the mind found its satisfaction in thinking out mere possibilities, or even in the persistent prosecution of certain detached ideas, it too easily forgot immediate Christian duties, or landed itself in a whirlpool of new errors; or, again, by the apparent profundity and logical consistency of pure speculation, or the deceptive charm of fine conceits, it obtained a means of introducing, partially or completely, un-Christian ideas.

These were the inspiring and helpful, and also the erroneous and dangerous, elements of the *Gnosis of that time*, which afterwards, when the more serious Christian minds had perceived more and more clearly its unprofitableness and perversity, was described and finally mercilessly branded in a purely bad sense as the work and aim of the *Gnostics*, so that when looked at in later times from its end gnosis acquired an entirely different aspect from that which it bore at first. It does not fall within the scope of this work—inasmuch as the movement reaches far beyond its limits—to describe the complete development of Gnosticism, which now first appears in the Christian Church with so much vigour; for the subject of this work it is also of compara-

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 194 sq.

tively small concern. But we must examine the commencement and the first action of the movement, that we may understand the wisdom and the energy with which it was resisted during these years on the part of the true leaders of Christianity.

Gnosis in itself, as we saw above,[1] is not only harmless, but, in opposition to the previous philosophy, something peculiar and essential to Christianity, and, indeed, a true ornament of it. As soon as reflection upon the consummated appearance of Christ and all that had been effected by him was possible, a number of new views and discoveries, such as had till then never been suggested, presented themselves both to the enthusiastic gaze and to calmer meditation. Of this we have proof in all the utterances and ideas of the Apostles, and particularly of Paul. And the very word *gnosis* acquired in the Apostolic age its new and truly Christian signification; but then it was still used in its full and best sense.[2] Originally, therefore, the word represented very many and sometimes very dissimilar things: as we have seen[3] it denoted allegory even, and after the Apostolic age Samaritans also came forward as Gnostics.[4] Accordingly all Christians who had the capacity and taste for it, naturally turned their attention to gnosis, whether they were Jewish or Heathen Christians, and, indeed, the former especially, as Philo and men like him belonging to Judeanism had long sought a deeper philosophy and had tried to establish it by all kinds of artificial means; until at last all gnosis was generally looked upon with suspicion and opposed on account of its bad effects. At the end of the period embraced by this history accordingly the word acquired a bad secondary meaning; and we may keep the Greek word in this its equivocal sense, which is so full of instruction as regards the history of the period.[5]

It would, therefore, be very wrong to suppose that gnosis did not arise until after the destruction of Jerusalem, or that it only then developed errors; careful examination shows the opposite on both points; and the most that can be said is that

[1] *Ante*, pp. 111 sq.

[2] As appears from 1 Cor. i. 5 and many other passages of the Epistles to the Corinthians; from Rom. xi. 33, xv. 14; Phil. iii. 8; Col. ii. 3. On the other hand, it is not without significance that even the word γνῶσις, taken probably from Ps. xix. 3 (LXX), is not found in the Gospels, save in the two passages (Luke i. 77, xi. 52) which betray the peculiar style of Luke, nor in the writings of John, and had therefore no proper place in the vocabulary of Christ. It is said most plainly 1 Cor. viii. 1, πάντες γνῶσιν ἔχομεν, that is, just as all Christians have, or ought to have, the Holy Spirit; and that both possessions are connected is taught by Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 1–8; so that the Gnostics might come by degrees to suppose that they were the only πνευματικοί.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 114 sq.

[4] *Ante*, pp. 83 sq.

[5] In German the name that would best correspond is *Vernunft* (reason), inasmuch as this easily becomes *Vernünftelei* (rationalism).

it was not until this new age that it was developed with ever fuller freedom, and that on that account it gradually gave rise to increasingly dangerous errors.[1] But we must now follow the traces of gnosis right back to its earliest efforts, as they are the most important for our purpose. It is true this is a difficult task. For these first efforts, as far as they were published in books (as we may reasonably suppose they were, at all events in the case of some), belong to the first of the three periods of the Gnostic movement which we must distinguish; they were very early quite supplanted and eclipsed by the much grander and more attractive efforts that soon followed. The writings of a Basilides, Valentinus, and others belonging to the most flourishing period of Gnosticism, were immediately, it is true, practically annihilated in a very similar way by the keen refutation which followed them almost as rapidly; so that now very few fragments of the writings of the Gnostics, which belong to the third and last period of Gnosticism only, have come down to us. But we are able to form a tolerably complete idea of the lost works from the very elaborate refutations which they met with and which we still in part possess.[2] It is only the earliest, and in their way most imperfect, Gnostic efforts that have now become, through all this, most obscure; and yet we must endeavour to form a distinct idea, as far as this is in any way possible, of the gradual growth of Gnosis from its first commencement, inasmuch as the truth is in this instance also corroborated—that in the case of all mental movements of any duration everything depends upon their origin and the way in which they are received on their first appearance.

We will pass over the passion of Gnosis, at first scarcely observed and yet in the end irresistible, which showed itself in the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures, and which the

[1] When Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 7, comp. 22, following an incidental observation of Clem. *Strom.* vii. 17, speaks of Gnostics only after the war under Hadrian, this is historically as inaccurate as when Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* i. 23. 2, ii. 1. 1, makes Simon Magus the first of all *Christian* heretics; for, although he adopted Christian ideas, he remained, as we have seen (*ante*, pp. 83 sq.), a thorough Samaritan. These later authors as they looked back upon the once dazzling Gnostic spectacle, then in its dissolution, might easily suppose that men like Basilides, Valentinus, Saturninus, and Marcion, whose books were then much read, and whose schools still to some extent flourished, were the first Gnostics; but that supposition was as baseless as the effort of some well-known people in our day to limit rationalism (or *Vernünftelei*) simply to the best known men and schools of recent times.

[2] The earliest of those refutations preserved are by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Hippolytus, also by Tertullian; but the earliest book known to us of Justin Martyr's was, according to *Apol.* i. cap. 26, a *σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων*. Earlier than these, but from the third and final stage of Gnosticism, are the *Pistis Sophia*, *Clement's Homilies* (*ante*, p. 126) as far as they introduce Gnostic elements, the Epistle of Ptolemy to Flora, and some other pieces that have come down to us (comp. vol. iii. pp. 318 sq.)

Christian Church even did not sufficiently withstand in the Apostolic age. Apollos of Alexandria, whom we met with on a previous occasion,[1] had undoubtedly put together a system of Gnostic ideas, and considering his distinguished mental gifts and his indefatigable activity, he would naturally have become an influential Gnostic in the bad sense of the word if the superior mind of Paul had not led him before it was too late to truer Christian reflection. But those Corinthian teachers, probably led by him, who, though they regarded themselves as good Christians, still supposed 'that the resurrection of the (Christian) dead was already past,' and was not to be looked for in the future, and was not, therefore, a fact at all (in the ordinary sense of the word),[2] there is little doubt started from the idea, which no one had so strongly urged as Paul, that Christians had suffered with Christ and must have risen with him; and as the ordinary conception of the resurrection of the dead appeared to them to be attended by difficulties which could hardly be removed, they conceived the rationalistic notion that it was not at all necessary to be believed, inasmuch as the resurrection in a very natural sense was already past in the case of thorough Christians. In fact, these superficial lovers of Gnosis were, according to all appearances, the same people who in Corinth had no consideration for others with regard to meats sacrificed to idols, appealing to the claims of Christian Gnosis,[3] which they alleged might convince anyone that in all such cases the Christian must exercise simply his new spiritual freedom. And while such precocious advocates of an exaggerated Christian freedom proceeded, under the pretext of Gnosis, from Paul's own school, as far as we can speak of a school in his case, his fiercest Jewish Christian opponents also, under the same cover of Gnosis, invented entirely different baseless edifices of thought which were meant to prove their peculiar opinions and promote their objects, as we shall soon see.

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 389 sq.

[2] That is, though the people refuted 1 Cor. xv. maintained *ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν*, 1 Cor. xv. 12, they were yet in Paul's view Christians, and did not deny the resurrection of Christ himself; without doubt therefore they did not simply proclaim this naked proposition, but in establishing it appealed to certain truths which were much more obvious, and, as they thought, established and undeniable; just as all parties in those days sought to establish their peculiar views in a scientific manner. It is therefore extremely probable that these people really said *τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἤδη γεγονέναι*, as the proposition is given 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18, which may very well be a fragment from an actual epistle of Paul's. In that case we have here, ver. 17, preserved the names *Hymenæus* and *Philetus* as the two teachers of this party, who, however, we must suppose, according to the locality of this epistle (i. 15), had then become influential in Ephesus; and in that case we may suppose the words Rom. xvi. 17–21 were called forth chiefly by this party.

[3] As plainly appears from 1 Cor. viii. 1.

It is thus evident that Gnosis, even in its darker aspects, was already actively at work in Paul's lifetime amongst all the various Christian parties, although we know but little or nothing of the names of its first professors.[1] But there is at all events one name preserved belonging to this period with regard to the significance of which subsequent writers were able to say something; and yet it would undoubtedly have quite perished from the recollection of subsequent generations if it had not, as it were by accident, been all along to be found in a book that was a good deal read, and was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. This is the name Nicolaitanes, which has been preserved in the Book of Revelation.[2] To later writers it is but as a dream from that wholly different period previous to the destruction of Jerusalem; and it is certain that the followers of this Nicolaus had their first true importance in that to them more favourable time. We cannot doubt that, in the first place, these people sought to support their views by various statements of a philosophical and apparently Christian character. This was, we know, at that time the favourite method which was adopted by every new and ambitious party; and the author of the Apocalypse, who knew them from personal observation, intimates plainly that the new doctrine of this party claimed to rest on veritable depths of wisdom and knowledge, and had, in fact, at the time of its primitive vigour even its enthusiastic prophets and apostles.[3] Further, we cannot doubt that these new teachers were teaching in and around Ephesus practically the same doctrines which were being gladly received in Corinth by those excessively free Christians to whom Paul addressed his warning words; they intended, as the messengers and agents of genuine Christian freedom, to go beyond Paul even, and supposed they could prove that a Christian was able without any danger at all to take part in Heathen sacrifices and ceremonies,[4]

[1] But we have already said what names we may nevertheless regard as belonging here.

[2] I have here stated more definitely what I had plainly indicated in my early work *Comment. in Apocal.* and subsequently more fully in the *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* viii. pp. 116 sq., and refrain therefore from repeating many points which have been sufficiently explained there. A statement of Hippolytus's (different from that in his work *Adv. Hær.*) is now published in *P. Lagardii Analecta Syr.* pp. 87 sq., according to which Nicolaus was the precursor of Hymenæus and Philetus above mentioned.

[3] According to the true meaning of Rev. ii. 24, comp. with ii. 2, 13–15, 20.

[4] Nothing else than this is referred to in those passages of the Apocalypse as the dangerous mistake of these people; we might, it is true, treat the second member of the phrase, taken from the Old Testament, in the description of their error, φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα καὶ πορνεῦσαι, as a distinct charge, and then interpret it as marking the immorality of these people, as has subsequently often been done, having an argument for it in the false doctrines of the Nicolaitanes. But in the Apocalypse itself this is not the meaning intended.

and, indeed, that he must even abuse the flesh,[1] that is, his physical nature, or employ it in such acts as were to be avoided according to commonly accepted principles, simply in order to show how far his mind was raised above these acts of the baser senses and how little he could suffer from them; and this they maintained was Christian freedom from the Law. And if we ask by what supposed deeper knowledge they sought to establish such dangerous principles, there comes to our assistance the reminiscence that these teachers had distinguished in the historical Christ himself a lower material Christ from the purely spiritual Christ who had descended from the invisible heights of heaven, just as they distinguished in God the lower creator of the material world from the absolutely spiritual and invisible God.[2] Indeed, in Paul's time all the conditions for a distinction of this kind already existed. The rigid distinction between the purely invisible and the sensibly revealed God had then long been made in the widely read writings of Philo and others;[3] the Gospel narrative of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Christ at his baptism,[4] according to many other indications, greatly struck the imagination and gave rise to a multitude of similar exaggerated ideas, as if from that moment the human nature in Jesus had wholly retired and become a pure phantasm.[5] But if such a distinction was supposed to exist in the historical Christ himself, if his visible humanity was thus completely

[1] Clement of Alexandria had heard as an old tradition (*Strom.* ii. 20, iii. 4) that the founder of the sect, Nicolaus, had the saying δεῖ παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκί; that he desired thereby to remove all suspicion that he was jealous of others on account of his wife and was afraid of the power of his fleshly desires. The error in this was simply that Clement supposed this Nicolaus must have been one of the seven deacons of the parent Church, Acts vi. 5, and then found it difficult to comprehend how such a holy man could live thus immorally. It is true Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* i. 26. 3) and Hippolytus (*Adv. Hær.* 7. 36) suppose this Nicolaus is the same as the deacon, and perhaps it is somewhat suspicious that he is placed last amongst the seven deacons, as Judas Iscariot amongst the twelve Apostles. But we have no historical basis for all this, as even the most accurate information which Clement could discover regarding him is too meagre to be of use to us.

[2] For when Irenæus in the following passage, where he once more returns to the Nicolaitanes, iii. 11. 1, calls them a branch of the Gnostics, but as much earlier than Cerinthus, Basilides and the rest, and ascribes to them the same views of God and Christ as to the latter, we have no reason whatever to regard all this as invention, inasmuch as he could not obtain all this from such a source as the Apocalypse, and we cannot see how or why he should have arbitrarily invented it. It is not necessary that the Nicolaitanes, to meet this description, should have used all the terminology regarding God and Christ which Irenæus employs when he briefly classifies them with the later Gnostics. It is to be lamented that Storr (in Eichhorn's *Repert.* xiv. pp. 128 sq., 171 sq.) without sufficient reason called in question the entire account of the Fathers, and thereby made the work of denying everything easy to his successors.

[3] Vol. vii. pp. 212 sq.

[4] Vol. vi. pp. 194 sq.

[5] The Fathers coming by degrees to call all Gnostics who thus reduce the historical Christ to a merely Divine appearance *Docetæ*.

degraded and his purely spiritual nature was so excessively exalted that his body became a mere phantasm, it might also easily be taught that every true Christian must similarly value only what is spiritual, despise as unimportant everything physical and corporeal, and, indeed, employ it according to his pleasure, though that employment should be an abuse, in the opinion of men of lower thoughts and merely fleshly natures. Hence they sometimes taught that every Christian who had sinned might become pure again on the eighth day.[1] We can thus still form an adequate idea of these first Gnostics of excessive Christian freedom, and may with certainty assume that a Nicolaus was really the founder of this party, which before the destruction of Jerusalem had a considerable number of adherents in Corinth and Asia Minor, and was at that time particularly dangerous.[2]

But the storm of that destruction and the first powerful shock which it gave to everything Christian scattered to the winds this first degenerate form of Christian freedom; the second generation of Christians, which grew up amidst the great Heathen persecutions that now broke out, resembled the contemporary Judean generation at all events in this, that it acquired an increased dread of everything Heathen; and as all fellowship in Heathen sacrifices was more rigidly avoided and a closer adherence was observed to the limitation of the abrogation of the ancient Law formerly provisionally fixed by the parent Church,[3] the Nicolaitanes were deprived of their most important mission; and assailed by such severe condemnation as that in the Apocalypse, they afterwards disappear from history for a long time.[4] But the passion for constructing similar baseless systems continued, although the ultimate object which it sought to attain and the course which it took were entirely different.

This appears immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem in the case of Cerinthus, a Jewish Christian educated, like

[1] According to Victorinus Petabionensis in the *Maxima Bibliotheca Vett. Patrum*, iii. p. 415.

[2] The Corinthian Nicolaus of the apocryphal *Acta Apost.* (Fabricii *Cod. Ap. N.T.* i. p. 498) may have been invented later from the traditional idea of the Nicolaitanes as πορνεύοντες; but if these people were already so powerful at the time of the Apocalypse, we can understand why they should be named after their party leader, although this is the first instance of the kind in the Christian Church.

[3] Vol. vii. pp. 359 sq. As the whole of the following history shows, the greater freedom formerly maintained by Paul had now to be won afresh.

[4] Tertullian *De Præscr. Hær.* cap. 33 confuses them with the Cainites of the second century; on the other hand, in the third or fourth century a new school must have revived the forgotten name of the Nicolaitanes, and have put in circulation new books professing to be written by the above Nicolaus, as may be seen from Epiphan. *Hær.* xxv.

Apollos, in Egypt, but subsequently teaching in Ephesus especially;[1] of whose peculiar doctrines we should likewise probably have been without the least knowledge if he had not (as we shall see below) met with the Apostle John in the renowned city of Ephesus and if the memory of this meeting had not afterwards been preserved.[2] The Gospel narrative of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus at his baptism had made upon him also the deepest impression; and, as he could not conceive as human all the sublime things which the Gospels relate of Christ, all his ideas of God and Christ received a dualistic form, which he made poor efforts to varnish over by the aid of new fancies. For, having beforehand abandoned himself to the Philonic idea of a double God and ruling intermediate beings, he conceived as the Creator of the world, not the first absolute almighty God, but a power far distant from Him, and, indeed, without a knowledge of Him, the work of which, therefore, admitted of subsequent improvements; and in like manner he ascribed to the long-prevalent notion of the Law having been given by angels[3] the special importance of supplying proof that it might be reformed in certain parts. As regards Christ he was, therefore, more ready to conceive that, according to the Gospel of Mark,[4] though Jesus was, as the son of Joseph and Mary, even before his baptism, more righteous and wise than other men, yet it was not until, under the form of a dove, that the Christ—that is, a purely spiritual power—descended upon him from the almighty God, who had hitherto been unknown to the world; that by this power alone he then proclaimed this unknown God and performed his miracles; that he did not suffer on the cross as Christ, but the Christ, as impassible, flew from him again before the crucifixion, and only the man Jesus was crucified, died, and rose again; and probably that the resurrection took place by the union with him once more, for the moment, of that purely spiritual power.[5]

[1] In this way there is no difficulty in harmonising the account of him in Hippolytus vii. 33 (the only new fact contributed by Hippolytus) with what is known of him from other sources.

[2] Hence the remarks of Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* i. 26. 1; iii. 11. 1, 7) with regard to his doctrine also are taken as from the first source, and they are then only repeated verbatim in Hippol. vii. 33. Some details not given by Irenæus were preserved in the mutilated work (afterwards ascribed to Tertullian) *Adv. Omnes Hær.* cap. iii.

[3] See my *Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus*, p. 81, and Beer, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und sein Verhältniss zu den Midraschim*, Leipzig, 1856, pp. 25 sq.

[4] Irenæus in this passage (iii. 11. 7), where he speaks of him again without mentioning his name, says so distinctly that he preferred this Gospel, and it is in itself so very credible, that when Epiphan. *Hær.* xx. 5, xxx. 3, and Philastrius, *De Hær.* cap. 36, ascribe to him the Gospel of Matthew, or rather the Gospel according to the Hebrews, they can do so only because they class him with the Ebionites.

[5] We must probably thus conceive what Irenæus has only too briefly in-

In this way Cerinthus, according to all that we can now learn about him, was the first who fully carried out the idea, that the supreme and purely spiritual Power descended upon Jesus and at times left him again, and made of this idea a new gospel. And while Marcion especially followed him in this, as regards the Old Testament he resorted to an entirely different inference to that which Marcion subsequently drew. For he taught that inasmuch as Jesus, even when the highest Power rested upon him and worked through him, continued to observe, not the whole, but certain portions of the Law given by angels, every Christian must also continue to keep those portions of it,[1] as, according to Christ's own saying, 'no disciple is above his master;' and thus the old Judean reappears pretty fully in Cerinthus. But this habit of mind, manifestly more attracted by poetic fancies than filled with an earnest Christian love of truth, might go on to produce its fancies without end. It might be supposed, for instance, that the absolutely Divine Power which formerly descended repeatedly upon Jesus, might in the future once more come down upon the Crucified One in the most powerful manner in order to bring about the end of human history, or (in the language of that time) the millennium. And Cerinthus taught this also, as we can gather with certainty from numerous indications.

Thus the most dissimilar inferences (with regard to actual life) might easily be drawn from the same fanciful suppositions and poetical speculations; and while Christianity had become the subject of the freest thought and imaginative speculation, before it had even overcome its first and most decided antithesis in the world, it was in danger, amidst such vain sports of thought and various new erroneous courses naturally connected therewith, of losing its true strength and significance.

The Contention against the Gnostics.—The Epistle of Jude.

We cannot name all those Gnostic schools which appeared in the course of the years immediately before and after the

dicated. It accords with his more poetic and enthusiastic than strictly meditative genius that he should conceive the millennium in a very material form; but the idea that he therefore wrote the Apocalypse is an unfortunate error of Caius of Rome in the second century, which would, like innumerable other mistakes, have soon been forgotten probably if Dionysius of Alexandria, and after him Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 28, vii. 25, had not revived it.

[1] προσέχειν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ἀπὸ μέρους, says Epiphan. *Hær.* xxviii. 1, with reason. On the other hand, nothing follows from what he further says §§ 2, 3, than that the life and labours of Cerinthus were in the third century employed to make a fiction similar to the Clementines, in which he had been everywhere represented as the bitter enemy of Paul and the other Apostles.

destruction of Jerusalem in all those countries in which at that time Christians lived in considerable numbers. It is, besides, unnecessary to do so. We can, however, see very clearly how wisely and resolutely the best Christian minds from the very beginning met the great errors which thus broke out, and which, if they had gone on unchecked, were calculated to destroy all real Christianity by agencies within the Church itself. The forces which were at work in the Gnostic tendency had not in these early years developed, still less exhausted themselves, as far as it was possible for them to do so; they might still go on to build much more artistic edifices of thought, such as were more enticing from their comfort and splendour, as in fact came to pass in the course of the second century. And yet it decided the future of Christianity that the right kind of resistance was offered to these wrong tendencies as soon as ever they appeared and began to spread; and it was thus especially shown what a store of clear insight and wholesome counsel was possessed by the Christianity of those days, as was so strikingly manifested by its most fitting human instruments.

Among the foremost early Christians there was no one, except John, so disposed as Paul to profound meditation on the great Christian truths now permeating the world and so likely to systematise definite conclusions concerning them, and so no one with so much inclination to a Christian Gnosis in a good sense. As a fact there proceeded from him numerous bright flashes of thought on this head such as were provoked at the time by the higher necessities of a difficult question. Subsequently not only Marcion but many other profounder Christian minds referred to his illustrious example. But no one perceived so early as he the hidden dangers of Gnosticism. All Christians as Christ's followers may and ought to have Gnosis as well as faith and every other Christian virtue; but Gnosis is only one of these virtues, and can be so much torn from its connection with other virtues and pursued with such selfish motives as to lead to the greatest errors. Above all it too easily puffs up its student, leading him to suppose that he has truth and insight which he really neither has at all nor correctly applies. By this judgment Paul thus early passes sentence on all subsequent Gnostics,[1] whilst without making any show he everywhere scatters the seed of genuine Gnosis. According to all indications, tares of overweening Gnosis shot up nowhere more

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 1.

luxuriantly than in the great Greek capitals—Alexandria, Corinth, Ephesus, and from the latter city throughout Asia Minor especially. In one of the last of his epistles, therefore, Paul used the opportunity to utter the most earnest warnings against such an incipient varnishing of simple Christianity, although the colour which the school in question actually used was that of an apparently very sincere piety.[1] And unlike the Apostle Paul as the author of the Apocalypse is as a writer, he does not hesitate, as if in rivalry with him, to pronounce, in his concise prophetic language, the *depths* of wisdom and insight, of which such Gnostics boasted, depths of Satan, just as Paul calls such wisdom the wisdom of the *world* and not of God.[2]

We possess, besides, in the New Testament a small book which was published with the sole purpose of speaking an earnest Christian word against such Gnostic errors, which had already in some places become serious. This book is the epistle, so remarkable also on its author's account, which '*Jude*, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James,' sent 'to them that are beloved in God the Father, and kept in Jesus Christ, called,' that is, in other words, to all true Christians. It will be shown below in detail that this Jude was the brother of James the Lord's brother, who had fallen a few years before the beginning of the great war,[3] and also his successor, as one of the Elders of the parent Church; we can, however, at once clearly perceive from the manner of the whole epistle, and especially of the salutation, that only a very important and generally esteemed Christian could have written it. No epistle with such important subject-matter can be simpler and briefer, or more unassuming than this, which is especially intended only to remind its readers of many things overlooked by them at the time, but of greatest importance, while it declines itself to teach or reveal anything; in fact, the author of it so little wishes to be considered an apostle that he even refers quite openly to earlier sayings of Christ's Apostles.[4] But this extremely modest writer knows well that he can address all Christians, without exception, on the subject of their *common* salvation; and because he is always diligent to do this when necessary, he turns to them on the present occasion with

[1] The Epistle to the Colossians.

[2] *τὰ βαθέα τοῦ Σατανᾶ*, Rev. ii. 24, is only another expression for *ἡ σοφία τοῦ κόσμου*, 1 Cor. i. 20, 21, iii. 19, comp. Col. ii. 20.

[3] See vol. vii. p. 456.

[4] Ver. 17; what earlier apostles' words the author here means we cannot now precisely say, as we do not know nearly as much of the life and death of each apostle as he did. It is enough to refer by way of example to the words Acts xx. 29 sq.

admonition and exhortation on a special subject.[1] Such anxious care to address all, when the necessity arises, is a characteristic mark of one of the Elders of the parent Church, as far as such a church still existed and had among its rulers a man so highly esteemed for his own worth as our Jude evidently was. And inasmuch as he was clearly (as appears from the epistle) not a man of such eloquence or so impelled by new insight of his own as to be unable to refrain from composing and publishing an epistle in so difficult a time, he writes, without doubt, rather at the call of his office, thinking that on account of his very position it is his duty towards all Christians at this time publicly to exhort and admonish them. Such unmistakable signs does this small epistle bear of being a general letter, addressed by the author as head of the parent church to all Christians, following thus the similar, far more important, and longer epistle sent by James to the churches generally,[2] and without such decisive precedent it would certainly never have appeared. For that it was issued later than the Epistle of James and not until after the destruction of Jerusalem is no less clear[3] than that it must have been written comparatively early in this period.[4] We may, therefore, very well assume that it was composed in the course of the first decade of this new period.

Another reason for the brevity of the epistle is, it is true, that it treats of only one subject, and we cannot doubt, judging from its manifest scope, that it was intended to warn believers generally of a new class of Christians who closely resembled the Nicolaitanes,[5] although they probably called themselves by another name and did not wish like them to take part in the Heathen sacrifices. In this short epistle these men are represented as giving themselves up to empty speculations and idle dreams,[6] like all other Gnostics, and as considering themselves very wise when, like Philo, they make a strict distinction between God and God, separating the purely spiritual God from the creation,[7] and making the latter to originate from an inferior God and lesser spirits only, as if they had not

[1] This is the meaning of the words at the beginning of ver. 3, which are thus very important.

[2] See vol. vii. p 450.

[3] From the simple fact that according to ver. 17 the Apostles, with perhaps one or two exceptions, were already dead.

[4] As appears from a comparison with the later Epistle of Peter of which we shall speak below.

[5] See *ante*, pp. 134 sq.

[6] This must be the meaning of ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι, ver. 8, since in its literal sense it does not accord with the context.

[7] On this account only can these men, ver. 19, be called so briefly οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, an expression which taken by itself is just as incomprehensible as when we say *the Dualists*, that is, becomes plain only when regarded as the denomination of a school, and here in this context clearly means the Gnostics with their claim to be Pneumaticists, but, as Jude immediately says, were only Psychicists.

created the world according to the will of the spiritual God (as Kerinthos similarly taught)[1] and as if, therefore, a celestial distinct from the terrestrial Christ would be obliged to reform this creation.[2] By these proud disorderly fancies they were little prepared and disposed for a quiet and humble Christian life; but in addition to this the restless and uncertain nature of the time was for special reasons calculated to bring their Christianity into confusion and serious errors. For it seemed to them that now, after the destruction of Jerusalem, the coming of Christ in his glory was unaccountably longer and longer delayed, while the sufferings of the Christians did not become less.[3] Hence they became gloomy and morose, inclined to renounce what was truly Christian and to flatter the Heathen,[4] and showed a growingly disorderly spirit also by celebrating the Holy Eucharist in an unclean and unworthy manner, debasing it to the rank of a common meal;[5] whilst in other respects no fruits worthy of Christianity could be seen in their lives.[6] But this debasement of that meal, which had long been accounted the holiest and dearest mystery of the life and love of all true Christianity,[7] was alone enough to create deep indignation in all who did not, like them, pretend to be the only truly spiritual and philosophic people. And Jude accordingly comprehends all the worst accusations against them simply under the two heads, that they (1) 'turn the grace of God,' i.e. Christianity itself, as is represented in the Holy Eucharist most clearly and forcibly, 'into lasciviousness,' and (2) 'deny the only Ruler (God) and our Lord Jesus Christ' in their fancies about a dual God and Christ.[8]

[1] See *ante*, p. 137.

[2] All this follows with certainty from a comparison of the disconnected descriptions vv. 4, 8–11, 19, and when the hints they contain are followed out. The κυριότης, ver. 8, is the true Deity which they practically deny by their dual God; the δόξαι, vv. 8–10, are the exalted Angels which they blaspheme by supposing they had created the parts of the world contrary to the will of the purely spiritual God, whilst, as was known, even Michael himself when he had to give an opinion on a certain point did not blaspheme, but submitted everything to the true God.

[3] It is not without good reason that reference is made ver. 14 to the powerful speeches of the Book of Enoch concerning the sure advent of the Messiah, and ver. 21 and ver. 24 to the certainty of the parousia; the greeting ver. 2 also alludes (comp. ver. 21) in a new way to the *mercy* to be hoped for at Christ's judgment.

[4] Ver. 16.

[5] The words ver. 12, comp. ver. 23, must be construed and interpreted as follows: 'who in your *Agapæ* filthily feast together, without fear feed themselves.' It is then immediately seen that the same defilers of the holy meal are here described as Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 20, 21, has so bitterly to complain of. The expression *Agapæ*, therefore, retains in this passage still its original meaning of the holy meal itself, which is not surprising according to vol. vii. p. 122. The word σπιλάς can just as well be derived from σπίλος, meaning *filthy*, as πηγάς from πηγή.

[6] According to the strong imagery vv. 12, 13.

[7] See vol. vii. pp. 120 sq.

[8] The words ver. 4 in so far are really the right prelude to the whole further description of these Heathenish Gnostics.

In view of these great newly introduced errors the author of our epistle considers it to be sufficient to exhort his readers not to betray the faith once delivered to them (by the Apostles).[1] He does, indeed, exhort them somewhat more in detail to beware of such persons, but in general only directs their attention to various examples of ancient times with which a comparison might be made, or also to old and new prophecies which could be applied to them.[2] Still, the most dangerous people are sufficiently portrayed incidentally for attentive readers by means of the descriptions here and there introduced, and it is briefly shown what is the right line of action towards them. A suitable conclusion can then follow in a very few words.[3] Such is this short book, which we might call the first example of a pastoral circular, since it is not intended, like the Epistle of James,[4] to be at the same time, or even primarily, didactic, but confines itself to simply reminding its readers of established Christian truths. It also differs from James' epistle by following more closely in language and style the loftier model of the epistles of Paul.

It is true that this short, and notwithstanding its decisive tone, very modest, epistle was so little permanently successful that it had afterwards to be repeated more strongly in a somewhat different form, as we shall have presently to narrate. But the truth it contained was by no means lost. The three so-called pastoral epistles, which have been received into the New Testament, will show us how the struggle with the Gnostics grew ever fiercer. But it was the hoary apostle John who fought against them with the greatest power; yet, before we can fully understand this, we must first form a correct view of a very different phenomenon of those times.

(c) *The new Thought and Learning of the Jewish-Christian Schools.*

We have already seen in many plain cases that all the varied movements and parties were strongly impelled by the new epoch which the destruction of the Temple ushered in to seek under the freedom now granted them a more enduring form. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that that party, which from this time forth may be most briefly and significantly

[1] Vv. 3, 4.

[2] The two sections vv. 5-13 and vv. 14-23, which are of nearly equal length, form therefore in reality the principal portion of the epistle, the plan of which can in this way alone be rightly perceived. This brief epistle has thus a proper plan, although this does not quite accord with the model of one of Paul's epistles.

[3] Vv. 24, 25.

[4] See vol. vii. pp. 450 sq.

called the Jewish-Christian, and which[1] had already attempted so much against the Apostle Paul, now likewise lifts its head again with wholly new vigour and even takes a new form such as might easily surpass in vitality all the creations of the Gnostics. In order to understand this more accurately we must carefully distinguish the following phenomena.

We might call those Christians who were born Judeans also Jewish Christians; the term would then be used in antithesis to the Gentile Christians, and ought more accurately (as long as there are Judeans in history, on which point see below) to be denominated Judean Christians. But the question of national extraction loses more and more all importance in the great matter of religion, as it henceforth displays itself; and we shall therefore call all those Jewish Christians who preserved more of the beliefs and ceremonies of the ancient true religion than was necessary and advisable after Christianity, when rightly understood in all its consequences, had been accepted. At the same time very different opinions might be held as to what of the old religion should be retained, particularly as at first great consideration was to be paid to Gentile or Jewish birth.[2] Again, the spirit in which more or less of the old religion was retained, was not always the same. For the point of departure might be either Judeanism as it had been most generally handed down in the broad stream of tradition in the old Community, or the philosophy of the Gnostics might be taken as a means of understanding the old and the new religions in a fresh light. Or it was principally the party of the Essenes that felt a strong impulse to draw nearer to Christianity; and undoubtedly no other party in the old Community stood fundamentally so near Christianity as that of the Essenes, with their deep need of a real piety and their bitter antagonism both to the Pharisees and the Sadducees.[3] From the fact that the Essenes formed a separate society outside the great centre of the ancient Community, it is easy to understand that they naturally continued to have for a time less contact with Christianity, which had arisen in complete independence of them; but as soon as the fame of it spread through its intrinsic greatness into even the most remote and hidden corners

[1] See vol. vii. pp. 351 sq.

[2] See vol. vii. *passim*.

[3] It is thus not very surprising that Euseb., *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 17, makes Philo's description of the Therapeutæ refer to the first Christians in Egypt, an error in which Epiphan., *Hær.* xxix. 5, follows him, without mentioning his authority; but the entire mistake arose chiefly from the error of Eusebius in supposing that Philo was a Christian who had met with Peter in Rome and had been converted by him, see vol. v. p. 376, vii. p. 201.

of the ancient Community, it must have exerted an attractive influence upon many Essenes which could only become more powerful with the lapse of time. As a matter of course, Essenism would in such cases seek to retain as much as possible of its own peculiar character; and as in some of the precepts of the Law it only exaggerated the scrupulosity of the Pharisees, many of the converts sought, while adopting the new Christian spirit, to continue a rigid life of penance and purification, following in this respect such examples as that of James the Lord's brother.[1] When the Apostle Paul heard of some of these Christians in the Church at Rome, who followed such stricter rules of life humbly and unobtrusively, his counsel was not to disturb them without sufficient cause;[2] but when he afterwards heard of certain people of this hybrid character who decked out their heterogeneous faith with a new overweening Gnosis and tried to propagate it by winning arts of speech and by the semblance of a vain piety, he then warned the Colossians and other churches in Asia Minor most earnestly against such backslidings, as they were of a kind to discredit and weaken the true glory of Christianity and to lower the unique elevation of Christ himself.[3] Thus many Essenic elements tried, even before the destruction of the Temple, to force their way into the infant Church; after that event they were introduced still more, and the adulteration of the Christian faith that threatened to follow was only increased.[4]

At that period before the destruction of the Temple, however, this possible Jewish Christianity, though differing widely in its constituent parts, had a position and importance altogether different from what it was destined in future to assume. At that time infant Christianity had not yet torn itself with so much toil and pain from its revered parent stem; and though Paul foresaw with such wonderful truth the higher necessity of its total separation, and as far as he could carried it out, it was still at that time humanly pardonable that as many offshoots from the old religion as possible should seek to live on. At the time of which we are speaking, on the contrary, the pure truth was much more apparent to Christians than at that former period; but on the Jewish side, after the fall of the ancient Community, more fragments of it eagerly forced their way into the Church in larger numbers than ever, above all many of the

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 169 sq.
[2] See my *Sendschreiben des Apost. Paulus*, pp. 418 sq.
[3] See further my *Sendschreiben*, pp. 464 sq.
[4] See *ante*, p. 7.

Essenes just mentioned.[1] Now, as these remnants of Judaism flooded the new Church principally in those places where the Essenes had till then been most numerous, Jewish Christianity, as a true combination of the old and the new religions, first took, in this age of freedom, a fully developed form, and gained gradually a very important independent position in the Christian Church. For when the churches in which comparatively few Heathen Christians had lived previous to the destruction of the Temple, now suddenly received this vast accession of Judeans, who in the midst of the calamities of the time did not know where to turn, but hoping to find a stay and refuge in Christianity if anywhere, resorted to it, the old Judean element was so much revived and became so predominant in them that the previous opposition between Paul and his antagonists might easily be once more roused to activity. After Paul's imprisonment, and still more after his death,[2] his opponents were able to operate more unrestrainedly, and the new age after the destruction of the Temple might soon supply them with fresh reasons not only for keeping up their opposition, but also for still further aggravating it.

The most decisive thing for the immediate future was really that even after the destruction of the Temple Christian churches continued to exist, or were even afresh collected and increased, in which Judeans by birth predominated both in numbers and mental force and influence. And no visible power could then prevent this, as it was in complete accordance with the past development of things. For if such churches actually existed, principally within the limits of the Holy Land, previous to the destruction of the Temple, why should they not continue to exist or even to multiply and consolidate themselves afresh after that event? What clear and palpable right had the churches which were composed mainly of Gentiles to require that the Judean churches should follow their lead in all the various customs and usages? The difference between the two kinds of churches previous to the destruction of the Temple was really only that circumcision and the observance of all the laws prescribed by the learned Judean schools, with the excep-

[1] It is thus not a mere accident that the name of the Essenes was interchangeable with that of the Nazarites, as we can infer from Epiphan. *Hær.* xxix. 1, 5; this was only the counterpart to the similar case explained above, p. 120. If the name Jessenes was used for Essenes in this connection, as we see from these passages, it appears to have been originally only a play upon the name Jesus (comp. عيسى *'Isa*, from Jesu, the common pronunciation in Arabic), but not upon the name of David's father, as Epiphanius thinks; that name is here altogether irrelevant. The Essenes disappear totally from real life as a large distinct society after the close of the first century.

[2] See vol. vii. p. 447.

tion of those previously discussed,[1] were remitted in the case of the Heathen Christians; and even this concession to the Heathen Christians was often regarded by those Judeans by birth who could not rise to the height of Paul's view, only as an indulgence which had to be allowed them for the moment and perhaps till the final decision of Christ when he should appear in his glory for the great judgment. The complete destruction of the Temple and dispersion of the nation ought now to have opened the eyes of all to the fact that so much only of the laws of the Old Testament could remain as was required by the absolute truths of the perfect true religion revealed for all nations alike. But when a man had once formed the conviction that Christ, who had himself kept the Law and had taught that it could not pass away *until all was fulfilled*, i.e. before the end of the present age,[2] had not yet come in his glory, he might logically maintain that the ancient Law must till then remain in force in such important matters as circumcision. The belief also was long kept up that when Christ appeared in his glory it would be in the Holy Land, probably near Jerusalem;[3] accordingly it still appeared to many that a little band of Christians of the primitive type must continue to wait for him there. And so, for such reasons, in this new age a number of churches arose based upon fundamental views of this kind; and as they retained circumcision, the Sabbath, and other Judean customs, they may be called Jewish Christian churches. It was the more easy for churches of this kind to hold aloof from the contemporary Gnosis, as they desired especially to retain the tried ancient religion in Christian faithfulness and hope; and in proportion as they kept themselves independent of the Gnostic mania of the age, they flourished with a vigour and permanency which secured them centuries of existence.

Local differences, however, are often in the case of imminent divisions of great moment. When the parent church fled in the year 66 to Pella beyond the Jordan, it may have kept for a time its centre in this town, but it follows as a matter of course[4] that many of its members must have settled in other

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 358.

[2] This phrase Matt. v. 18, which occurs in a similar form frequently in the Sibylline books, signifies until *everything foretold had come to pass*, so that after the fulfilment of the destinies of the world which prophecy had long touched upon an entirely different form of things becomes possible. The words Sib. iii. 575, 815, are earlier.

[3] The belief is well known; it is expressed also Rev. xiv. 1, 20 (comp. *Jahrbb. der B. W.* viii. p. 80).

[4] This is, however, expressly mentioned from an evidently early source in Eutychii *Ann.* i. pp. 339, 343. The most accurate information on this point is given us by Eusebius when, in his *Onomasticon* (ed. Larsov, Berlin, 1862) he remarks in the case of various towns of Peræa that Christians dwelt in them.

cities farther to the east; and when Essenes and other Judeans adopted Christianity in considerable numbers, they will have generally resorted to them if they did not like the proximity of the Romans. As generally after the destruction of Jerusalem many Judeans in flight from the Romans migrated into countries farther to the east, it was more easy for a Judean character to be communicated there to Christianity, as appears from the indication mentioned above [1] and from many other signs.

How simple and harmless at first the idea of such churches was, that in them the Apostolic parent church simply was perpetuated, may be gathered from the clear illustration supplied in the Epistle of Jude.[2] But very soon greatest difficulties were almost unconsciously developed by the mere existence and consolidation of such churches. Except in the farther East they were found almost exclusively in the Holy Land, or in any case in its vicinity, where the Judeans were in the majority from the very first. What, therefore, was to be done when Heathen Christians, perhaps in isolated cases only, desired to join them? And as the Heathen churches continued to grow in numbers and power, what was to be the attitude towards them of these Jewish Christians who did not scruple to go on bearing the yoke of the Mosaic Laws? Would they acknowledge them as full Christians equal with themselves? Thus the same difficult questions under the pressure of which Paul had increasingly to contend until his death, now reappeared, and reappeared with the great twofold difference, that now the preponderance of the Heathen Christians and of the freer Christianity they preferred had been decided, and that a Christian parent church in the Holy Land, such as had existed until the last war, ceased with the destruction of the Temple to exist for the Heathen churches. In consequence the sense of that preponderance and the dread of being crushed by the views and resolutions of the Heathen churches, no less than the absence of any close connection with them, which had hitherto been supplied by the parent church, tended now to the result—that the Jewish Christian churches on their part generally kept more scrupulously aloof, compelled the few Heathen Christians who desired to join them to a more rigid observance of the Law, and were unwilling to acknowledge the freer Christians as having equal rights with themselves. The dissolution of the previous ties, and the greater freedom with which everything could be afresh arranged in this new age, produced also the effect that the party which

[1] *Ante*, p. 125.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 140 sq.

Paul had so forcibly resisted was able to work more freely than ever; Christianity no longer existed in its first concentrated freshness and vigour, and it was more easy than in Paul's days for the various parties and tendencies which were then latent in it to separate from each other. There thus arose the evil of an alienation, or, indeed, hostility and mutual exclusion, between the two kindred churches; an evil which had reached its height towards the middle of the second century when Justin Martyr wrote his Dialogue with Trypho, and which is nowhere described more graphically than in this Dialogue.[1]

But when once the spirit of scrupulosity and exclusiveness had laid hold upon such churches, and if thus Pharisaic tendencies were able in some way to find insensibly a refuge in them, it is not surprising that that spirit soon crept in still farther and seduced at all events a portion of these churches to yet greater deviations. We must not overlook the fact that in proportion as the Jewish Christian churches rigidly separated themselves from the larger Heathen Christian world, they were compelled to approach much nearer to the Judeans in the form in which they then continued to exist, and must have sought, like the Christians, to reorganise themselves. If individuals still continued to go over from the Judeans to the Christians, they naturally preferred to join these hybrid churches; and, in order to explain and defend their own peculiar position, these churches were obliged to employ mainly Judean learning. But the new Judean schools began at this period zealously and thoroughly to examine the fundamental views and faiths of primitive Christianity,[2] and to refute them in their fashion; and the method they adopted in doing this is nowhere more plainly shown in its great general outlines than in the views, doubts, and arguments of Trypho against Christianity, which Justin Martyr has at length and graphically presented in his Dialogue with him.[3] These schools reproduced essentially the objection

[1] Cap 47. Justin in this passage is not inclined for his part to exclude from salvation such Jewish Christians if they will only acknowledge the freer Christians and not seek to compel them to adopt their narrower faith; but at the same time he regards those as not wholly certain of salvation who permit themselves to be misled by them. This lenient judgment which he passes on these parties is in complete accordance with his customary moderate stand-point, for generally he does not take the position of the stricter followers of Paul, and distinguishes himself plainly enough from them, as we shall immediately see.

[2] *Ante*, p. 44.

[3] The highly educated Judean Trypho, with his philosophic pretensions, with whom Justin fell in at Corinth, as described in his Dialogue, fled according to cap. i. into Greece before the war of Hadrian. Supposing that he was then far advanced in years, we might conjecture that he was the Judean Rabbi who is often spoken of in the Talmud under the name טַרְפוֹן (usually pronounced *Tarpôn*) as teaching in Lydda

of Caiaphas at the condemnation of Christ,[1] that the man Jesus, who appeared, moreover, in such humble circumstances, could not be, as he maintained, the Son of God and the true Messiah promised in the Old Testament. Since the glorified Christ had from the very beginning of Apostolic Christianity[2] been conceived as far more exalted than this, in fact as in the highest degree exalted and Divine, and it was this very deification of Christ which had made subsequently rapid progress (as we shall see), they carefully collected arguments to show that according to the true religion a man can never be God; they explained in another way the numerous passages of the Old Testament in which Christians saw a prophecy of the appearance of the Logos or of his action previous to his birth; and, in short, they endeavoured unfairly to put another meaning on everything in the Old Testament which appeared but remotely to favour the Christian faith.[3] And thus the proper interpretation of the Old Testament became especially a point of debate between them, as if it might be explained in accordance with any preconceived views;[4] but in reality the contention was much more concerning the ideas of God and man and their possible connection.

Much as the Jewish Christians may have resisted such a Judean denial of Christ, they still gradually yielded more or less to these energetic and obstinate Rabbinical objections, though it might only be with the object of sheltering themselves against attacks from that quarter. And thus there arose three different positions which we can plainly distinguish. Some Jewish Christian churches not only adopted the usages of the Old Testament, but they also held with those Rabbis that Jesus had always been simply a man, took great pains to establish this view from the prophetic passages of the Old Testament, and to refute the interpretation of them which had till then been customary amongst Christians. They maintained that Jesus had been justified by the complete observance of the Law such as no

M. Taanith, iii. 9), and according to (*M.* Aboth ii. 15, 16, Jadaim i. 3, Sota ix. 9, 10, Sukka iii. 4, Nazir vi. 6, and many other passages, is mostly placed amongst the contemporaries of Akiba, and at all events as later than Jochanan ben Zakkai. It is true, the Talmud gives no indication of any such flight as that mentioned above; according to Talmudic reminiscences he had even seen the Temple.

[1] Vol. vi. p. 374.

[2] Vol. vii. pp. 54 sq.

[3] The whole Dialogue should be read, but see especially with regard to the deity of Christ capp. 68, 126; with regard to the prophecies capp. 67, 126; with regard to the denial of the appearance of the Logos in the Theophanies of the Old Testament capp. 48, 56, comp. *Apol.* i. cap. 63. It was accordingly only logical that such Rabbis should refuse to find angels in the sons of God, Gen. vi. 1–4, as appears from cap. 79; and thereby they commenced from pure rationalism the false interpretation of this passage which subsequent Fathers reproduced, comp. *Jahrbb. der B. W.* viii. p. 101, ix. 138.

[4] Comp. especially *Dial.* capp. 33, 83.

one had exhibited before him, and that on that account he had been made the Christ; that, therefore, other men could become like him only when they followed him in this respect.[1] This humanitarian view of Christ might then have a certain justification in the case of ordinary Christians in opposition to the incipient exaggeration of his deification; but those early Christian times were the less capable of settling this rising controversy as to the humanity or Deity of Christ, as the great question on which all depended at that time was whether the Heathen gods should make way or not for the new God who came out of Israel to attack them. And while these Jewish Christians kindled what was pretty much a strife about words, they forgot in their exclusiveness all the higher things of Christianity to such an extent that they rejected all the doctrines and writings of Paul as an apostate from the Law, and retained of the Gospels only one in a form which corresponded best with their own narrow views.[2] Others supposed they could combine their loyalty to the ancient customs and usages with a higher estimate of the Divinity of Christ, and allowed the use of the present Gospel according to Matthew with its introduction teaching the conception of Christ by the Holy Ghost: so that the belief of the birth of Jesus from the Virgin became the mark distinguishing them from the other class.[3] A third party, while adhering in all other respects to the Heathen Christians, retained a certain reserve with regard to Paul's writings, and did not place him amongst the foremost witnesses for Christ; and the numerous exaggerations of the freer tendencies of this apostle to which so many Gnostics resigned themselves, misusing his writings, might excuse them. To this party belonged Justin, who subsequently fell as a martyr in Rome, a Samaritan by nationality, who was converted in Palestine itself about 130 A.D., and who subsequently remained true to the Christian tendencies of his youth.[4]

[1] Which is very plainly said in Hippol. *Philos.* vii. 34, whilst in other respects Hippolytus only follows Irenæus verbatim.

[2] According to Iren. *Adv. Hær.* i. 26. 1 (quoted more briefly in Hippol. *Philos.* x. 22) it would have been the Gospel of Matthew; but as it appears from iv. 33. 4, v. 1. 3, comp. iii. 15. 1, 21. 1, that Irenæus intends the first class of Jewish Christians, although he does not further distinguish their various classes, this Gospel must in the above passage have been confounded with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, whilst our present Gospel of Matthew is, on the contrary, fully adapted for the second class of Jewish Christians. Comp. *Jahrbb. der B. W.* vi. pp. 36 sq.

[3] We may here follow simply the few but clear statements of Origen (*Contra Cels.* v. 61) regarding these two classes of Jewish Christians.

[4] It is only thus that we can form a clear conception of the position of Justin; he is certainly not an opponent of Paul, but he does not use him as a primary source of Christian conviction in the same way as his first admirers known to us use him. Irenæus, iv. 6, 2, speaks spe-

When the great Heathen Christian Church in the second and third centuries looked back upon these Jewish Christian parties still existing in Palestine and Syria, they were in the habit of denominating the Jewish Christians by a name which did not receive its peculiar unfavourable meaning until the time before us. This is the name Ebionites, which is not met with until this comparatively late time,[1] and acquires at once its bad secondary meaning, though as it signifies in Hebrew, at all events in the Old Testament, nothing more than *the poor*, it cannot at first have had this unfavourable signification. At first the Jewish Christians when they went amongst the Heathen may, like Paul, have called the members of the parent Church *the poor*, as contributions were collected for them in the Gentile churches;[2] and this name *Ebyonîm*, as taken from the Psalms and other books of the Old Testament, might easily denote *the poor of God*, or those who were specially worthy of the Divine pity on account of their undeserved privations and sufferings.[3] After the destruction of the Temple, this denomination of the Christians of the Holy Land could not be so easily forgotten; but it then acquired the more readily this unfavourable secondary meaning, since those Christians had separated themselves as Jewish Christians more and more exclusively. It was accordingly at first the general name for such Christians. Yet by the time of Origen *two kinds of Ebionites* were distinguished, which were the first two of the three above-mentioned classes of churches. But in the fourth century, when both these classes had still further separated themselves, the members of the second class came to be distinguished by the special name of *Nazarites*, by which Hebrew word all Christians had from the first been, rather satirically than otherwise, designated in the East,[4] whilst in the Greek language it was primarily only thoroughly Eastern or Jewish Christians who were signified by it.[5]

cially against those who object to Paul altogether. Unfortunately the book of Justin against Marcion, mentioned by Irenæus iv. 6. 2, in which he must have given his opinion further on all these points, has been lost.

[1] The first author in whom we find the name is Irenæus.

[2] Vol. vii. p. 358.

[3] אֶבְיוֹן has in the Old Testament in so many passages this meaning, almost as much as עֲנָוִים; and in earlier times the name *Chasidim* had, in fact, been similarly taken from the Psalms, see vol. v. p. 282. I need not surprise us that Origen and Eusebius can make no better than a satirical use of the name.

[4] Greek Christian authors did not from the very first use the name readily, as it carried with it often a contemptuous meaning (comp. vol. vii. p. 334), but it remained nevertheless very prevalent in the Hebrew and other Eastern languages.

[5] According to Epiphan. *Hær.* xxix. 30, the Nazarites dwelt chiefly in Western Syria, about Beræa (Haleb), but the Ebionites chiefly beyond the Jordan; the former, therefore, made geographically also a transition to the universal Gentile Christendom of the West. Epiphanius and Jerome, however, are the first writers

As all such Jewish Christian churches arose rather from the circumstances and times than from profound ideas and systems of thought, they could not boast of any leading individuals as their originators and founders,[1] since no one would have believed them if they had sought to appeal to an apostle, for instance, as their authority. In the last place, those churches which assumed at the same time a Gnostic form of development, such as the adherents of Cerinthus,[2] and particularly the new Baptists of Elkesái,[3] differed again from the Jewish Christian churches of this simpler form.

The Life and Writings of the Apostle John.

By the formation of such Jewish Christian communities a good portion of Judaism seemed about to continue its existence under a Christian covering, in a somewhat altered shape, just as it was about to vanish from the world. And in reality the tenacious strength of Judaism and the wealth of lofty gifts which were still present in this degenerated form of the ancient true religion can be nowhere better observed than in these various endeavours, some attended with great success, which it made to preserve its essential tendencies, even in the midst of Christianity.

But nothing is more fatal at any time to the growth and fruitfulness of all the original forces and necessary efforts of true Christianity than such a falling back into the spirit of that piety of legal compulsion by the purest and most vigorous

who use this name, whilst Origen still speaks (*Contra Cels.* vi. 51) only of δίττοὶ Ἐβιωναῖοι, and Eusebius also follows him substantially, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 27, with all his verbosity.

[1] This is at the same time the decisive reason why we may not derive the name Ebionites from a wise man, Ebion, of whom neither Irenæus, nor Hippolytus, nor Eusebius, nor the *Const. Apost.* vi. 6. 1, know anything; it is Tertull. *De Præscr. Hær.* cap. 33 and elsewhere, who first invented such an originator, and Epiphan. *Hær.* xxx. has sought to carry this invention further. But Epiphanius, xxx. 2, has nothing further to say of an Ebion than that he lived in the little town Kôkab beyond the Jordan at the time of the great war (and undoubtedly there was a Jewish Christian church there as well as in the neighbouring Pella), and that he was a Samaritan by extraction: he might have read this in one of the numerous fictitious stories. It is very instructive in this connection that Eusebius in his *Onomasticon*, under Χωβά, not far from Damascus, mentions that Ebionites dwelt there; but it is Jerome who first, in his additions, derives these Ebionites from an Ebion.—But though this is the case with regard to the Ebionites, it does not follow that other party-names arose in the same way, and that Nicolaus e.g. (*ante*, p. 136) was later derived from the Nicolaitanes. Ebion is the one solitary name belonging to this age which was subsequently invented as the head of a school.—The first man who systematically developed the Ebionite views of Christ in a book was Theodotus of Byzantium at the time of Victor, Hippol. *Hær.* vii. 35, x. 23, comp. Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* v. 28, and the details in Epiphan. *Hær.* liv.; Irenæus does not yet speak of him.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 136 sq.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 122 sq.

triumph over which it was really brought into existence. And nothing could have been more fatal at that time, during its first efforts to shape itself perfectly, than the victory in the world of this semi-Judaism with its captivating halo of ancient true religion and its pretended rigorous enforcement but actual dissipation of genuinely Christian duties. But as yet a true sense of the life of the perfect true religion, as Christ had brought it into the world, had been preserved too pure and too fresh—as yet the bright transparency of the spirit proceeding from him had been transmitted too directly to this second generation of Christians—to suffer the danger not to be at once most plainly recognised and repelled for all the future. In reality, all the writings which have been preserved from these decades are more or less intentionally directed against the Jewish Christian spirit; and with what energy especially Paul's disciples and friends endeavoured to counteract this threatening ruin in the most varied ways, will become more evident farther on. But now it was especially an old man, on whom the sun of Christ's life had once shone in its warmest, fullest brilliancy, who shed the warmth thus kindled upon the world of those days as it was growing colder, and dispersed all its other gloom by the rays of his spirit thus illumined.

This old man was the Apostle John, of whose great importance to the Christian Church this is the proper place to speak. A distinct feeling pervades the whole of early Christian antiquity that he really had such a great importance, and, indeed, that it was wholly without a parallel; and the memory of the details of his life became gradually obscure only as in all other similar instances. But since in recent times the most lamentable efforts have been made to still further dim that memory, and if possible to destroy it, the greater care is needful to re-establish it in its full truth as far as it is discoverable.

We have already seen[1] that John, with his elder brother James, stood in a closer relation to Christ than any others of the Twelve, and that a loving zeal for Christ's cause animated the two brothers to such a degree from the first that his stern word was needful to restrain it. The elder brother, as we are justified in conjecturing, probably fell as a martyr partly in consequence of the unrestrained force of an outbreak of his warmest enthusiasm for Christ, as we have observed above;[2] but in the case of the younger one, when we pay due heed to the indications to be found in his writings, we find after the glorification of Christ,

[1] Vol. vi. pp. 302 sq.

[2] Vol. vii. pp. 269 sq.

a marvellous combination of apparently opposite spiritual qualities. On the one hand, there remains in him to the very end a profound fire of enthusiasm and decision for the truth and majesty of Christ which nothing can damp, and which sometimes till the very last breaks out in bright flashes and is never completely kept under because it has too deep a foundation. On the other hand, we find a calmness and equanimity, and, indeed, a kind of delicate reserve and shyness in him, which expresses itself in the most remarkable way even in the form his life takes in the world. For he was always considered in the parent church as one of its main pillars, was in equal estimation with Peter, who was much his senior, and, evidently because he surpassed his older brother James in mental vigour and resource, was early employed in company with Peter in various ways, both in and beyond Jerusalem, as speaker and representative of the Church.[1] But nevertheless he soon entered upon an entirely different course of activity from that of Peter. Whilst the latter early displayed on his own account the greatest activity as an advocate and preacher of the cause of Christ, and partly in consequence of this was very soon induced to leave his native land, so that he laboured more beyond than within the Holy Land, and is met with more than any other of the Twelve as the apostle of Christ to the scattered descendants of Israel,[2] we find John, on the contrary, remaining all along more quietly in Jerusalem, and to all appearances only leaving this centre with the entire parent church at the outbreak of the war with Rome,[3] just as afterwards we find him similarly residing permanently in Ephesus only. Evidently various peculiar influences must have combined to make of him an apostle of an entirely different type from all others. Such influences were the grateful duty assigned him by Christ himself[4] of caring for the Lord's bereaved mother, the check of his first youthful excitement by Christ's own words, which must have left the deepest impression, a characteristic warmth of love for Christ which found in itself its deepest satisfaction, and which no one

[1] This may be inferred with certainty from Acts iii. 1–4, 11; viii. 14. On the other hand, in Acts xv. he does not any more appear so publicly prominent in connection with those important transactions, see vol. vii. pp. 355 sq.

[2] Vol. vii. pp. 184 sq.

[3] It has been entirely without reason inferred from the fact that James only is mentioned as visited by Paul, Acts xxi. 18, that John had left the parent church and transferred his abode to Ephesus before the Roman war or indeed before Paul's last visit to Jerusalem; but we have seen (vol. vii. p. 432) that it was enough to mention James alone in this connection in the character of president of the church.

[4] Vol. vii. p. 128.

but he could feel in such a way, as the result of his personal experience, and a growing inclination to quiet meditative reflection upon the course of human life and the Divine mysteries.

Entire Christian antiquity unanimously informs us that John took up his abode in Ephesus after the destruction of the Temple and died there in peace in his old age, although we no longer know the year in which he went thither. Without doubt a man who, notwithstanding all his inward fire, had become so calm and established, who moreover was in any case approaching old age, would not have changed his place of abode without some powerful cause and a convulsion destructive to the existence of the parent church in Jerusalem; and from all known indications this convulsion can have been no other than the dispersion of the parent church from Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple. It is, however, very important to observe at this point that before he settled at Ephesus another John lived there as a Christian teacher of repute, who had likewise been a disciple of Christ himself, at least in the wider sense previously described.[1] This was the John who, to distinguish him from the apostle, was subsequently usually called in Ephesus, John the Presbyter, because he had been one of the presbyters of the great Ephesian church. In the third Christian generation Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, could still give a good deal of information about him, as he had amongst other things carefully inquired with regard to all the reminiscences of Christ's words and deeds that were known in Ephesus.[2] The graves of these two Johns were afterwards shown in Ephesus, and the two men were still clearly distinguished.[3] It is this simple Presbyter John

[1] Vol. vii. p. 129.

[2] According to the passage from the book of Papias, preserved in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 39. 4, comp. § 14, which must be thus interpreted, 'If any one who had followed (i.e. lived with) the Elders came, I inquired about the sayings of the Elders, what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip, or what Thomas, or what James, or what John or Matthew, or any different (ἕτερος) disciple of the Lord, and what things *Aristion* (of whom we now know nothing more, but who evidently, like the next disciple, had lived in Ephesus) or the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say.' The name *Elders* embraces, therefore, both the Twelve and the other disciples of the Lord, according to a usage peculiar to the time of Papias; and he himself belonged, according to these plain words, to the third generation. But Eusebius very erroneously afterwards draws from these words the inference that Papias had himself heard Aristion and John; this is not implied in the passage, and λέγουσιν is simply a variation of the previous εἶπε, and it is not necessary to consider that any strict difference of tense is intended. The things once said by such men they continue to say so far as their sayings are looked at as authoritative sources; and it is precisely λέγει, λέγουσι that are often used in the present in this sense. It is also for this reason incorrect that Papias, who fell as a martyr under Aurelius, according to *Chron. Pasch.* i. 481, had himself been a hearer of John's, as Irenæus in the first instance said, v. 33. 3, 4; but he may have seen him as a child if he was an Ephesian.

[3] It was not only Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 39, who had heard this, but Dionysius of Alexandria before him according to the

who wrote the Book of Revelation,[1] about A.D. 68–69, in which he shows himself to be not only a genuine Christian prophet, but also a man who was from his own personal knowledge most intimately acquainted with the condition of Christians in Ephesus and the neighbouring Asiatic towns, whilst he makes not the remotest claim to speak as one of the Twelve. Nor does it appear from the Book of Revelation that the apostle had then come to reside in Ephesus; and we are justified in supposing that this presbyter did not live to see the apostle in that city. It was on that account the more easy that the two men should subsequently be confounded, at least so far that the Revelation, when it was highly valued, should be ascribed to the apostle. This was the case as early as the middle of the second century,[2] but that cannot lead us to deny the historical facts. On the contrary, we shall not succeed in retracing the true history of the apostle if we seek in any other way to unravel its tangled thread.

We do not know whether the apostle removed to Ephesus immediately after the flight of the parent church from Jerusalem or not; his natural constancy would lead us to infer that he probably first went with it to Pella. But whether he took up his residence somewhat earlier or later in Ephesus, the fact that he went thither and did not remain amongst the Jewish Christian churches is very instructive, and necessarily became of great importance for the development of Christianity generally in those days. For it was in the East especially, as we have seen, that the spirit of the Jewish Christian parties was growingly influential. When, therefore, John chose Ephesus for his residence, he gave the plainest proof of his disinclination towards those parties, with their increasingly narrow tendencies, and of his high expectations with regard to the Gentile Christians. The church at Ephesus was a great influential centre for the Heathen Christians, and the spirit of the Apostle Paul was predominant in it as well as in the churches of Asia Minor generally. Nothing else could be expected, it is true, than that in so large a city, and one in which Christianity had made

words preserved in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* vii. 25. 16; and the thing itself admits of no doubt. This John is also meant in the *Constit. Apost.* vii. 45. 1.

[1] See vol. vii. p. 527.

[2] As appears from Justin Martyr's *Dial. c. Tryph.* cap. 81; but no one who is at all familiar with the character of this Christian philosopher will place any confidence in his literary judgment, as his *forte* and mission lay in quite another sphere than in seeking to settle such questions. But unfortunately his widely read books exercised undue influence on subsequent scholars; thus, though Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* v. 26. 1, 30. 3, speaks only of John *the disciple of the Lord* as the author of the Apocalypse, he undoubtedly means the apostle, inasmuch as he nowhere clearly distinguishes between the two.

such great conquests, Jewish Christianity should be very active; but an early tradition still tells how strenuously John avoided any close contact with Cerinthus,[1] and how vehemently on that occasion the ardour of his youth again broke out into bright flame.[2] Had the apostle been animated by a less quiet, modest, and serenely contented spirit, when he passed beyond the confines of the Holy Land he would, we may be sure, have gone at once to Rome, and, as the last of the Twelve or of the 'Pillars of the Church,' have commenced there far-reaching labours such as no other Christian could have undertaken; but he was impelled by another spirit.

Yet though he thus modestly limited his range of effort, his mere presence in this one centre of the Greek world, and his persistent and active interest in the existence and development of true Christianity, could become of the greatest importance and lead to the most happy results. It was not in accordance with his position and his previous history in Jerusalem that he should undertake any special office in the church at Ephesus, not even that of the chief elder or bishop. Just as he had long held in the parent church, with others of the Twelve, simply the honorary office of an elder,[3] he preferred now to think of himself still as 'the Elder' and thus to describe himself when it was necessary;[4] and everyone knew what he meant by this designation, namely, that he spoke and acted not as filling any special office in the church, but only as this individual with a unique history and exalted memories. In fact, he would even have lessened the weight of his influence on the Church generally if he had then accepted in the great and rich city of Ephesus an official position, however great and far-reaching it might have been. However, it was not according to his own inclination and habit, especially with his advancing age, to interfere with the business of the churches, to undertake various difficult matters as they happened to arise, or to demand a supreme pastoral and judicial position, whether in Asia[5] or in the Church at large, and thus to set the first example of the injurious

[1] See *ante*, p. 136.

[2] We refer to the tradition in Irenæus, iii. 3, 4, that John was about to enter a public bath in Ephesus, but suddenly rushed out of it again because he saw Cerinthus in it, and at the same time advised the friends who were with him to flee 'lest the bath in which the enemy of the Truth was should fall upon them;' an isolated popular tradition merely, but one which must be based on fact; according to Irenæus, it was said to have been told by Polycarp; and it is a purely arbitrary invention when in later fictions Ebion takes the place of Cerinthus, Epiphan. *Hær.* xxx. 25.

[3] See vol. vii. pp. 166 sq.

[4] See *Jahrbb. der B. W.* iii. pp. 181 sq.

[5] As might appear from Eusebius's account, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 23. 1; but Eusebius introduces here his later notions; Irenæus ii. 22. 5, iii. 3. 4, who is quoted by Eusebius himself, says simply παρέμεινεν αὐτοῖς. According to Clement of Alexandria, *Quis dives*, cap. 42, *ad init.*, he

ambition of later Roman bishops and popes. According to all reminiscences, the old man, who retained all along his youthful vigour, remained during his entire residence in Ephesus in a position of honourable retirement from public offices, and in the enjoyment of a quiet leisure which was only occasionally interrupted by the storms of the outside world; and from this whole period, tradition spoke of only one act of his in which the first ardour of his Christian life impelled him to hasten forth from Ephesus to complete an unfinished work of Christian rescue in the face of the most threatening difficulties.[1] As he lived thus in quiet retirement, and to human view commanded so little admiration or fear, it is the less surprising that many were inclined to look down upon the poor old man and thought it beneath them to pay much heed to his advice, which was the case with an elder named Diotrephes belonging probably to a neighbouring church.[2] The Christian Church was then already so widely extended, its members so numerous in Asia Minor especially, and it was permeated by such various spiritual tendencies, that the advice of even a man like John would not meet with immediate and universal approval; moreover, primitive Christians generally were far removed from a slavish reverence of an apostle though he might be the most distinguished and conciliatory; and at the time before us apparently the most divergent views and counsels of many apostles, and most of them already deceased, could be appealed to. But all who were able properly to appreciate a man of such a unique character as the Apostle John then bore, with a due perception of his historical and personal greatness, must, when they came near him in his voluntary retirement, have been wonderfully attracted. And according to all later accounts it was a small

went into the neighbouring cities, at all events, only when a church requested him, and there consecrated bishops at times.

[1] It is this story, recorded by Clement of Alexandria in the passage just referred to, which is in substance as follows: In a neighbouring town to Ephesus, John solemnly committed to the care of the church and its bishop a fine Heathen youth whom he accidentally met there. The bishop then instructed and baptised him, but under the idea that he had been saved when baptised he afterwards neglected him. Misled by evil men, the youth sank much lower than he was before his baptism, and actually became the captain of a troop of banditti. When John heard of this, reproaching the bishop for his neglect, with all the daring of youth the old man himself rode forth into the midst of the robbers, and tried all Christian methods in order to save the young man; bringing him at last to full repentance. I am unwilling to repeat here the long story on account of its inimitable beauty. No one of sound judgment will maintain that it is simply an imitation of the parable of the prodigal son, although Clement introduces it as *μῦθον οὐ μῦθον· ἀλλὰ ὄντα λόγον*; which is, however, only his mode of speech.—The mention of the restoration of a dead person to life at Ephesus by John, Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* v. 18. 14 (after Apollonius) is too purely incidental.

[2] See with regard to him *Jahrbb. der B. W.* iii. pp. 181 sq., comp. viii. pp. 218 sq.

circle of intimate friends and disciples especially amongst whom he laboured in Ephesus.[1] Many Christians of neighbouring towns also enjoyed his confidential friendship; and down to the very end of his life neither the desire to help wherever he could by counsel and deed nor the self-sacrifice needful was ever wanting.[2]

And in truth no nobler or more illustrious and attractive person could be found in the whole Christian Church of that period than the Apostle John. In these first forty or fifty years of its existence in the world without the visible Christ, Christianity had passed through the greatest changes; it had burst its first Judean garments as the butterfly its chrysalis, and translated itself freely from its first birthplace into a wholly new and wider world; and having escaped its first integument, it was just soaring aloft in boldest flight in order to subjugate the whole world. But while occupied in this tremendous movement, and now at last above all amidst the great world-revolution which had most severely affected its birthplace, almost all the strong pillars had fallen who had at first borne up the primary edifice of its world-wide Church, and with them perished the human instruments of its existence, whom the Spirit of Christ himself had most directly, purely, and fully possessed and animated. A second Christian generation, permeated and rent by the most dissimilar party tendencies, was about, not only to take up, but to carry further and complete, in a most tempestuous and distracted age, the final task of its predecessor. How easily might this new extensive erection, with its summit lost in the heavens, have wholly collapsed after the fall of those pillars, if one of them, in the very midst of the edifice, had not, with its loftiest capitals and great strength, remained immovably firm until a number of new ones could rise with equal firmness by its side! This one exceedingly graceful and slender but firmly founded pillar, remaining as it were in the centre, was our Apostle John. By his whole genius and his previous history he was just at this time fitted to supply the place of a hundred other of the strongest stays of Christianity; and if, in consequence of his modesty and voluntary retirement, he had almost been forgotten in history amidst the growing storms of the previous period, now after those first storms had blown over

[1] As the example of Gaius in the third epistle shows: I have shown in *Jahrbb. der B. W.* iii. pp. 174 sq. that the two smaller epistles are really from the apostle.

[2] It is enough here to refer to the contents of the second epistle when properly understood; comp. further my *Johanneische Schriften*, i. pp. 503 sq.

and a new and calmer day dawned, he became by virtue of his simple presence, with his unique life and experience, and by quiet labour in his own manner, in his venerable age, the true centre of progressive Christian history. In his youth he was privileged to bask in the full glory of the sun of Christ's earthly life, and to have his whole being penetrated and warmed by its immediate rays; in after years, as he grew in independence, for more than the ordinary term of human life, he let those rays of celestial brightness and certainty, amidst the most stormy and turbulent movements, work with growing purity and assurance upon his heart and mind; and now he had long gained the calmest and securest serenity of soul by an absolutely firm faith in the peerless truth of Christ. In that new generation, therefore, he stood forth as transfigured in the glory of that sun of unparalleled brightness; he was like a sweet reflection of the glory of Christ which had then as it were vanished again, as his herald and believing hero in this late age, as a refuge and loving defence for all those who were longing for the same serenity of pure life and an equal faith in the highest truth which had certainly appeared. Thus in him were happily combined the two great things which could in that age lead to salvation: on the one hand, the richest and surest recollection of the entire manifestation of Christ himself in its full truth, perpetually freshened by the most vivid and loving meditation upon it, and often overflowing in narratives of equal elevation and feeling; on the other hand, corresponding with this loving memory of the past, constantly watchful and calmly serene labour for the cause of Christ in that age (and when necessary in opposition to all its new dark troubles), together with that higher assurance and serenity which was now quite possible. This age needed both these things that it might at last reach calmly the full development of Christianity; and the greatest blessing of the time was that both had been actively combined so long most successfully in this most capable instrument and most noble and venerable hero. His labours proceeded thus from a sunny and calm elevation, and took a universal and general range, and were in all cases directed by the purest Christian energies and motives; in opposition to all earlier or more recent errors, he firmly maintained and made a free course for the primitive intentions and powers of Christianity; he started from the simplest and most permanent facts, and to them he led everything back, and thus his work was the most beautiful and powerful revival and continuation of the work of Christ himself that was possible. It was, therefore, as if an afterglow of

the original glory of Christ, both in its gentleness and endless love as well as in its clear decisiveness and vigour, had once more appeared in the man who had been as by a higher destiny preserved for this late generation. Moreover, with all this vivid recollection of the historical appearing of Christ, and this revival of him for a new time, he had the clearest perception of the special character and peculiar needs of that time. If it needed a fresh and deeper inquiry into all wisdom, and had been so active in this respect, as we have seen,[1] in his calm and profound meditativeness John was abreast of it in this matter, while, unlike the ordinary philosophers or Gnostics of the day, he did not lose himself in wild transcendentalism and seductive vagaries. Jewish Christianity was then seeking to extend itself in a new and more threatening manner; but at length by means of quiet thought and firm action it might be more easily repulsed in the one proper way, after Paul had at the right moment obtained a victory over it as by storm. John was now able to proceed against it much more calmly and successfully, but it was his special merit that he did this just then and in the proper way. Thus by his mere presence he laboured in such a favourable place as Ephesus, quietly in voluntary retirement; and yet his influence was in all directions so pacific and so soothing, so instructive and so effective, that his work in Asia especially could never be forgotten, and the most important subsequent teachers and heads of the churches of Asia Minor loved to appeal above all to his example and his teaching.[2]

But useful as it was that John should, by the unwearied force of his discourses and his active assistance, powerfully influence the Christians of his narrower or wider circle, his best friends might nevertheless feel very strongly that he was able to labour in another way with far greater results. For at the time literary activity had long found in the Church universal acknowledgment and effective employment. After Paul's influential precedent, epistolary literature, as most suitable to the local and temporal circumstances of the Church at that time, had been developed into the most perfect form, and had already

[1] *Ante*, pp. 184 sq.

[2] For instance, the above-named Papias; Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, his direct disciple, according to Irenæus, in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* v. 20; Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus towards the end of the second century, according to his own words in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 31, v. 24. Anything of this kind is not mentioned of any other of the Twelve, and although it is undeniable that men like Papias and Justin of the third and fourth Christian generations fell often in literary matters into various errors, it is still quite unmistakable that a broad stream of genuine Christian life in Asia Minor proceeded from John, and that through him this country became a true second nursery of Christianity.

become the most powerful instrument of rapid instruction and explanation with regard to the pressing questions of the moment. The literature of the Gospels, too, had then reached a high degree of perfection:[1] and in these two very different branches the firm foundation of a true Christian literature had been laid, to which other branches could now be easily added. John, it is true, had not till then had any share in this new form of Christian labour, which had grown up with such marvellous rapidity; the whole of the Twelve, moreover, had from the first had too little previous training for it, with the exception of Matthew, who must by his earlier secular office have been accustomed to use his pen, and of whom we know how skilful and enthusiastic he became in the literary service of Christianity; and John had, further, always been of a too quietly meditative disposition to readily take up this new work of his own accord. But although he may have been for his own part little disposed to labour by this most powerful means of imparting information in the service of Christianity, there was a sufficient number of friends about him in Ephesus to induce him by their requests and representations to undertake such a task. Ephesus, too, was of all places the most suited for such work; and John must himself soon have perceived how usefully he could thus labour. A man of his depth of character and quiet persistency, notwithstanding all his fiery enthusiasm, may have made himself gradually more fully acquainted with the Greek language, even before he left Jerusalem, since long before the destruction of the Temple Christianity made its way chiefly amongst the Heathen, and, as we know with certainty, a Greek work like that of the Epistle of James could then be issued from the parent church.[2] The fact that John now chose Ephesus as his permanent abode, shows that he could converse without any great difficulty with Greeks; and if his knowledge of Greek was in any respect defective, his Ephesian friends could easily supply the deficiency. In his old age, therefore, he was induced to write, and thereby he adorned his Christian services with their most enduring crown. But we know that in this he yielded only to the urgency of his friends,[3] and we can still plainly

[1] This point might have been further dwelt upon in vol. vii. if I had not already discussed it in the essays published in the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* from No. I. p. 113 onwards. But some details will be further referred to below. [See Translator's Preface to vol. vi. pp. vi sq.]

[2] See vol. vii. pp. 450 sq.

[3] At all events in relation to his principal work—the Gospel. See on this point *Jahrbb. der B. W.* iii. p. 174; but this may also be supposed in the case of the first Epistle.

perceive that in this he proceeded with the utmost calmness and, indeed, with most delicate shyness.

It was thus especially that his first work, his Gospel, arose, if we like still to use the name Gospel of a book which is by its originality and independence, and especially by its entire plan, so far removed from all previous Gospels, and which (as closer examination shows) though written without reference to several earlier Gospels, surpasses them all in the most surprising manner. On the margin of the primitive Christian age and before it has wholly passed away, there are here at last once more collected into a wonderful picture the memories of the life of its absolutely incomparable creator. This is done with inwardness and warmth, with an absolute love of truth and genuine veracity, as well as with marvellous lucidity and graphic reality; so that in this picture Christ's memory is for the first time glorified for all ages, and must for ever shine forth as the highest attainment of all human history. Whoever really understands this book and is also well acquainted with both the earlier Gospels and the tendencies and dangers of the time, will undoubtedly perceive plainly enough that the aged apostle now vividly realised to himself afresh all the memories of his youth with a reference to those Gospels, and also with the most intense feeling of the most recent errors of his day; that he did this in all the fervour of inmost reverence and with the most earnest endeavour to comprehend fully in thought the entire being and history of Christ; and that it was on the basis of this new and glorified recollection that he afterwards wrote the book without a break and as a great connected whole. As, therefore, the image of the historical Christ was then daily growing less clear and fixed in the hearts and imaginations of very different classes of men, and as it was exceedingly difficult to present a picture answering fully to this highest appearance the earth had witnessed, John gives above all a clear, distinct, and connected sketch of Christ's life such as answered to the incomparable elevation of his history. Though he does not therefore narrate all the historical details which he knew or could learn (for he presupposes the other Gospels), he portrays all the more fully, distinctly, and spiritually the heights and summits of the story. And it is just this which is the great and glorious main point with him. While, again, Gnosis was already, as we have seen,[1] making every effort to give currency to views of Christ and his work supposed to be very profound, John is so

[1] *Ante*, pp. 130 sq.

far from evading the examination of such deeper knowledge, that he begins his historical narration upon the basis of it, and propounds a philosophy of Christ and his work by which all the serious errors of the Gnostics already in vogue might be easily refuted. He proceeds simply from the basis of that idea of Christ which could present most plainly the Divine aspect of him, and which had then long been in existence, but had not been applied to Christ fully and consistently enough. We refer to the idea of the *Logos*. It was known long before Christ appeared,[1] so that even the name the *Logos of God* could be used alone in higher discourse for Christ,[2] who as a fact realised it by his appearing as far as this was possible in human history. As we saw in the last volume,[3] the Logos had since Philo's time occupied much more generally the profounder thoughts of men, and yet it was John who first connected it most lovingly and appropriately in the full extent of its applicable meaning with the clear recollection of the historical Christ. For beyond all dispute it supplied the one best existing means of expressing the eternal and purely Divine significance of the historical appearing of Christ; and for this purpose it could serve most perfectly. The really essential elements of the idea of the Logos as applied to Christ by John are that the Divine love and truth were first revealed clearly for every man most perfectly in Christ, as far as that is possible in human history and in a mortal body; that after Christ's appearance all human action and endeavour must be judged according to this perfectly revealed supreme love and truth; that therefore the same hidden Divine truth and love, which existed before the world began, and will in all future time be the same even in judgment, shone forth in him as he spoke and worked in human nature, and this for all mankind. No other existing conception could so perfectly and intelligibly represent this connection between the eternal and the temporal, the hidden and the revealed realities of God and man. So John works it out in the noblest manner. And already a sufficient interval had elapsed between the past appearing of Christ and that age; Christ had already proved his unparalleled truth and saving power in the hearts of thousands of his followers, and above all in that of his beloved disciple;

[1] Vol. vi. pp. 117 sq.

[2] Rev. xix. 13 as well as in the Book of Enoch. So far as the time was concerned it is accidental that the author of the Apocalypse is the first in the New Testament to use this name simply for Christ; but it would be the greatest mistake to infer from its usage that he was John the Apostle; on the contrary, in the writings of the latter the name even appears in a still briefer form, and especially in a much more definite sense. The unusually concise expression the *Logos of Life*, 1 John i. 1 (comp. below), also points to a long-established use of it.

[3] vii. pp. 203 sq., 209 sq.

and thus it was time clearly to recognise and believingly to establish for all time his eternal significance. And if Gnostics sought, as we have seen,[1] to make of Christ a mere angel, or other phantasmal being, John, on the contrary, expresses the pure historical truth by his new and original declaration, *the Logos became flesh*, which can be understood only by reference to its heretical antithesis. If, on the other hand, the elevation and, indeed, at times the pure poetic flight of language with which he brings into prominence the Divine elements of Christ's appearance on the earth, might easily forsake too much the firm basis of the terrestrial fact, he then holds the more strictly to the fine border line between the Human and the Divine, so that in reality God remains, in accordance with the ancient true religion, alone in his absolute exaltation.[2] And thus, as regards this its Divine aspect, which it was then needful to give prominence to, John presented the true idea of Christ's work in the world, so that nothing can be conceived to surpass it, and every effort to transcend its elevation must inevitably lead to new and serious errors. And if Jewish Christian ideas were at that time put forward afresh,[3] the true narration of Christ's relation to the Judeans, as it appeared down to his crucifixion, was all that he need give to refute them; and the manner itself in which he speaks of the Judeans reveals the wide difference between them and every true believer in Christ's word. If, again, the disciples of John sought once more to grossly misconceive Christ,[4] it was enough for him to state more forcibly as many of the facts of the original relation of the Baptist to him as were pertinent. It is true that in this way his reminiscences of the past are more strongly coloured whenever they are brought into closer connection with the phenomena of his immediate present; but it could not well be otherwise when they were revived with such vivid interest in a mind like John's in this greatly altered age. Nevertheless, this book cannot be compared to Plato's reminiscences of Socrates; and its object is so seriously to present absolutely historical truth that it incidentally corrects with great brevity many historical details which were related less accurately in the earlier Gospels, and carefully states where John's own subsequent way of conceiving anything, or that of

[1] *Ante*, p. 137.

[2] If later theologians overlooked and overstepped this fine border-line, they yielded to a one-sided and exaggerated view which soon produced its evil consequences; John himself stood much too close to the actual historical Christ to be able to fall into these errors of later generations.

[3] See *ante*, pp. 138 sq.

[4] See *ante*, pp. 119 sq.

all the other apostles, more or less differed from the real sense of the words of the Lord which he had once heard.[1]

This is the book which was destined to become the greatest of the New Testament, not less by virtue of its original power and the peculiar historical position of its author, than by its absolutely sublime matter. We may very well believe that it was written about the year 80, in the form it originally bore, that is, as far as the twentieth chapter; but it is no less certain, according to all indications, that it was not published until long afterwards, shortly before the death of John, and then with the addition of the twenty-first chapter, which may have been added to it considerably later. For as the apostle undertook this book only at the request of his friends, and finished it with their assistance, he most likely desired at first that it should not be published until after his death, as the legacy of his love to all true Christians, and that, as his life was afterwards prolonged beyond all expectation, he yielded to the requests for an earlier publication in consequence of a special inducement, which may be easily gathered from the added chapter. This inducement was supplied by a superstition, soon to be referred to more particularly, which had arisen with regard to his long protracted life; it appeared to be advisable, without loss of time, to dispel it before his death, although to hasten the publication of the whole book itself appeared otherwise the less necessary as it was intended only for Christians of education, while at the time of its production there had long existed a supply of Gospels for ordinary use.[2] We can discern in this only another trait of the inward repose, content with its own inner life, and of the shy reserve which were such characteristic features of this apostle.

It thus happened that a book which was written by John after the Gospel came to be published before it: this was his

[1] E.g. John ii. 19–22; comp. similar instances vi. 6, vii. 39, xii. 33, xviii. 32, xxi. 19.

[2] On all these points and the certainty of the authorship of the Gospel by the apostle, see further *Jahrbb. der B. W.* iii. pp. 146 sq., iv. pp. 178 sq., viii. pp. 188 sq. and elsewhere. There are other views regarding the authorship of the Gospel which have been started still more recently, and are equally baseless, and which can be shared by those only who have no accurate acquaintance with either this book or ancient Eastern historical literature; such views, for instance, as that the Gospel was written by a disciple of the apostle after his death, or that only a small part of it is from him. Comp. further *Jahrbb. der B. W.* xii. pp. 212–24; *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1865, pp. 166 sq.; 1867, pp. 507 sq. They make the greatest mistake who seek to cover their errors by making the two Johns of Ephesus *one*, whether the one be the apostle or his namesake. This is contrary to the surest evidence, and is an invention of pure necessity. Those who sought to make out that the one Ephesian John was the apostle, supposed they could thereby render the apostolic origin of all the four New Testament books under this name the more certain: that was a mistake, but the opposite one is a hundred times worse.

longer Epistle, which in the form it took had necessarily to be sent at once into the world. This Epistle bears still more fully than the Gospel the marks of his most characteristic language, and evidently of the language of his most advanced years. We observe, too, from its style that it was written in an entirely different period and in complete independence of the Gospel. When he resolved to write it, the Gnostics, against whose pernicious doctrines he speaks in the Gospel also, and whom he undoubtedly was then well acquainted with, at a distance at all events, had come into his own neighbourhood and had displayed their morally questionable conduct without any restraint. If the Gospel had then been already published, he would scarcely have found it necessary to publish a further special epistle against them; but as that was not the case, his friends may have exhorted him the more urgently to send forth his public declaration before it was too late; and though unwillingly, he may have felt compelled by the great injury the Gnostics were doing far and wide to yield to his friends' requests. And as it had then become a growing custom[1] to write in epistles to the Church at large on important general questions, in his special circumstances he found it still more appropriate, in lofty repose, almost as a glorified patriarch already raised far above the errors of the world, to address himself to Christians generally as to his children, and to leave them in this epistle a final testament of his love. In this way arose an epistle (though it can scarcely be called such) which pours forth, as in serenest certainty, a rich stream of the highest Christian truths, and in the midst of its course strikes with keenest words the false teachers who had in the first instance occasioned it, but without ever mentioning them by name or specially describing them.[2]

It may be taken almost as self-evident that in Ephesus the apostle wrote also to single churches and persons when urgently called upon to do so; but accidentally only two epistles of this kind have been preserved, and both were published together and concerned the same church. For, as we see from the illustration they supply, in this case also the apostle remained true to his natural disposition by writing with as great brevity as possible, so that most of these epistles might easily perish. But we see from these two epistles, too, how troubled the circum-

[1] See *ante*, p. 111; vol. vii. pp. 452 sq., pp. 476 sq.

[2] Comp. on this epistle *Jahrbb. der B. W.* iii. pp. 175 sq. and my *Johanneische Schriften*, vol. i. pp. 429 sq.; on the words περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, i. 1, comp. my subsequent note in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1863, pp. 1595 sq.

stances of Christians in those parts then were in relation to the public authorities, so that on that account long confidential letters were not freely written.[1]

But even the shortest letter from the hand of this venerable apostolic prince, whether it was published before or after his death, must have helped powerfully to allay the storms of the time, and must become a lasting contribution to the true Christian view and treatment of matters. For after the raging storms of the first Christian generation and its great victories, the most important task assigned to the second generation was, in opposition to recent errors, to firmly maintain, in the general view of the nature and the duties of Christianity, those things which had really been already acquired and to complete those things which were yet lacking. In those circumstances it was a great blessing for this generation that the apostle who had once lived on most intimate terms with Christ himself was still alive and so vigorous; by his very name and by his calmly reflective and firmly settled Christian attitude he was able to powerfully oppose all new errors and properly to defend all that was truly Christian. It was reserved for him to witness this first ripe harvest of Christian life in the world and to secure it by his own labour; and whilst in contemporary Judeanism there was no one who could have laboured with such quiet effort and such happy results, he supplies the first great instance in the Christian Church of the general law, that the ripening fruit of the noblest efforts and struggles of many always in the end coincides at the right time with the solid quiet labours of some one faithful workman who gathers them all up, enabling thus a new and better state of permanent good to be established. Amidst all the fresh troubles of the new age he kept his position as in immortal youth, and, according to all reminiscences, did not die before the reign of Trajan,[2] and was then ninety years of age, if (as many things render probable) he was born ten years after Christ. When he could no longer visit the Church save as attended by his friends, he was still unwilling to be absent whenever it met, but then always simply repeated

[1] This is implied in the expression, 'I am unwilling to write to you *with paper and ink*, or *with ink and pen* (2 John ver. 12; 3 John ver. 13), as if this would be unsafe.

[2] According to Jerome *De Scriptoribus Eccles.* cap. 9 he would have died in the third, and according to the *Chron. Pasch.* i. p. 470 in the seventh, year of Trajan's reign; but the earliest writer known to us who refers to the point, Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* ii. 22. 5, iii. 3. 4, says simply that he lived in Ephesus until the time of Trajan; Eusebius, following Irenæus, has no more definite information to give, either in his *Chron.* ii. p. 681 or in his *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 23; we do not know upon what later writers found their statements.

the saying, so well known in his books, 'Little children, love one another.' And when he was asked why he always reiterated this word only, his reply was, that he did so because it was the commandment of the Lord (to which he so often and emphatically refers in his books), and because if it only was done it was enough. It is true we get this incident only from a somewhat late book,[1] but it is exactly like John, and may well be a genuine ancient reminiscence borrowed from an early book. We have no trustworthy information as to his having ever suffered severe persecution;[2] probably his increasingly quiet and retired habit of mind preserved him from it; and it was a great gain for the whole Christian Church of that day that his life was preserved so long. When the venerable apostle, as if by miracle, grew so very old and already a third Christian generation began to grow up around him, the belief, assisted by the still prevailing desire to see Christ's coming in full glory, actually arose with regard to him, that as the early favourite of the Lord he would remain alive until he came, that he might then, in accordance with the early apostolic hope, enter into his glory without seeing death. But as soon as the venerable man heard of this, he caused the superstition to be put down, as far as a word of Christ's in support of it was appealed to. And this was the circumstance which induced him to publish his Gospel before his death.[3]

The Outcome of the Conflict with the new Errors. The fundamental Principles of the true progressive Church.

There can be no room to doubt that thus the Apostle John became in this age the Divine instrument for the defence of the pure primitive truth of Christianity against all the various errors which now for the first time grew so powerful and so dangerous. He maintained that truth against the various

[1] Jerome, *Comment. in Epist. Gal.* vi. 10.

[2] When later writers all relate that he was banished to Patmos by Domitian or (as others said) by Nero, this opinion was taken simply from Rev. i. 9 (improperly interpreted, moreover), in consequence of the confusion of the two Johns above referred to, p. 157; and when Tertullian (*De Præscript. Hær.* cap. 36) has even the account that he was dipped in boiling oil before his banishment to the island, this plainly contradicts the much more trustworthy reminiscence referred to above, p. 104, and he could only derive this legend from an apostolic romance, of which there were many at an early period. But when Polycrates in the passages cited above, p. 162, calls him a *μάρτυρ καὶ διδάσκαλος*, a *Christian witness and teacher*, the idea of *witness* occurs here, as appears from the whole connection, only in its primary Christian sense, according to which all true Christians, and especially the Apostles, ought to bear witness for Christ openly and fearlessly before the world; and this John had done throughout his entire life.

[3] See *ante*, p. 167. Comp. *Jahrbb. der B. W.* iii. p. 171.

followers of the Baptist,[1] as they carried to excess some of the primitive elements of Christianity; he defended it against the advocates of a false freedom in thought and conduct, without on that account fighting shy of the boldest philosophical inquiries or the depths of true knowledge; he defended it, finally, most stoutly where it might easily suffer most acutely—against the arrogance of belief in hallowed tradition and of a righteousness by works such as was then on the point of once more making way amongst the Jewish Christians. He maintained the fundamental truths of Christianity as they had from the first been communicated, and at the same time as they required to be in form reconstructed to meet this fresh age with its new errors and also its new knowledge taught by the experience of history. This we must afterwards note in the case of further special instances. And he defended those truths in this way with a decision which never wavered, and at the same time in accordance with the primary eternal law of Christian love, not seeking the favour of men, and yet down to his old age met by the suspicion and enmity of some Christians, while all the time he remained an immovable centre around which all true Christians naturally gathered.

We have here the foundations of the progressive and genuine Christian Church. For it is only when the fundamental Christian truths continue in such living and growing operation as we find them here, that the Church founded by Christ himself is in its immortal youth, and with the constant acquirement of new knowledge and new capacities, perpetuated in such a way that it can at length hope to attract all to it and become more and more an instrument of universal blessing for all mankind. In the midst of his labours as head of his Church, Christ had said[2] that offences must come, and Paul had found as early as his day that there must be schisms.[3] At the time before us, when for the first time such great freedom of external movement was possible to the Church, and everything might be tried, the inducements to a variety of fundamental views and movements in the Church were rapidly developed, and, giving way to them, there arose a number of differing Church parties, under the mutual misunderstandings and hostilities of which the unity and universality of Christianity and its primitive Church were threatened with complete dissolution. But from Christ and his spirit, after it had once established its power and operation in the world, there goes

[1] *Ante*, p. 119 and p. 166.
[2] Matt. xviii. 7.
[3] 1 Cor. xi. 19, comp. i. 11 sq., Gal. v. 20.

forth perpetually a stream of life in the true knowledge of Him and His influence; and as his true Church, even before the close of his earthly life, arose from that source, it is maintained from the same stream through all time after his departure, always finding at the right moment fresh and proper stays and supports, such as our apostle above all proved himself to be at this time. This is the Church which is always building itself up from the same fundamental truths and powers which Christ himself when on earth used in founding it; the Church which is always renewing and reviving the treasure of its knowledge and power in the true conflict against fresh errors and in the light of history; the Church which may confidently hope to become a more and more universal instrument in the promotion of the kingdom of God and the consummation of man's relations to God.

It is the greatest achievement of the conflicts within the Church of this period that just then, when it was for the first time in the history of Christianity most necessary, these fundamental bases of a true and progressive Christian church were laid for all future ages; and if a number of the best Christians co-operated in laying them, there was none who had a larger share in the work than our apostle.

We nowhere meet in this period the name of a *Catholic* church;[1] and the meaning which was subsequently given to the word by the Byzantine or the Roman bishops, and which is still given to it, is anti-Christian. But everything true and imperishable that is implied in this easily misunderstood epithet, we meet in full existence in our period. It has already been decided that in a great church, in opposition to manifold errors and devastating schisms, those same fundamental views and influences remain in supreme force by which Christ himself formerly founded his Church, and that they are not lessened or weakened, but, on the contrary, increased and strengthened, by the experiences of subsequent history.

Together with this greatest achievement it was possible that some things perceived more correctly by individuals at an earlier period were now less firmly maintained, and that thus some defects were again generated. When the conflict concerning fundamental truths is so fierce and obstinate as it then was, it is not easy for the attention to be directed equally to all

[1] For true as the principle is, *ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία*, Ignat. *Ad Smyrn.* cap. 8, it was not written by Ignatius himself. In *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1860, pp. 986 sq. I have criticised other very false ideas which recent writers have formed regarding the origin of a *Catholic* church.

less important details, and many things will be overlooked as comparatively indifferent. Thus the exceptions from the abrogation of the Mosaic regulations concerning food, which if Paul had continued to labour longer would no doubt have been gradually disregarded universally, were now pretty generally retained;[1] on all hands a false freedom was so rampant that a more strict observance of what had once been conceded by all the Apostles was now natural; and thus it was left to a later age to carry out fully what Paul had regarded in his later years as allowable on this point. In such matters of comparative indifference John looked rather at the general freedom of Christians, and gives no hints either for or against the laws regarding food. Similarly, different modes of keeping the Passover became common; and in that matter John adhered simply to the custom prevalent in Ephesus, so that in later times his example was appealed to when the question of the proper observance of the Passover became a subject of controversy.[2] But we possess, from an entirely different quarter and from a somewhat later date, in

The Epistle to Diognetus

a small but fine literary memorial of this period of the consolidation of Christianity, to which reference was made above,[3] and which teaches us essentially the same thing. The name of its author was soon lost, in which respect it is like the Epistle of Barnabas, although it is not, like this work, addressed to all Christians who will read it, but to a respected Heathen of the time. As later readers were unwilling to place it amongst the oldest Christian writings, it was put, probably pretty early, like several other similar works, with the works of Justin Martyr, amongst which it is now, however, found in a few manuscripts only.[4] It was written undoubtedly at a somewhat later time

[1] See *ante*, p. 136; *Const. Apost.* vi. 12. 7; vii. 20, 21; viii. 47, 63; Euseb. v. 1. 26. The great pains taken by the author of the Clementines to defend the laws regarding food shows, it is true, that in the second century they were very much neglected by many Christians. See also Origen *Contra Cels.* viii. 29 sq. [Comp. now *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, ch. vi.]

[2] See on this point *Jahrbb. der B. W.* v. pp. 203–6; viii. p. 199; xi. pp. 255 sq.

[3] *Ante*, p. 117. The epistle from cap. 1 to 10 forms a complete work; the present conclusion, capp. 11, 12, must originally have been the end of an entirely different book, which was of its kind a fine production, but which was written in a very different age, some twenty or thirty years later. The object of this latter work it is somewhat difficult to discover from this closing fragment of it; it was undoubtedly addressed to Christians and not to Heathen, but in the first instance to a Gnostic, known to the writer, with his adherents, people who were seduced by their Gnosis to all kinds of immorality and contempt of the Church; and the book accordingly contained probably an exposition of the true Gnosis and an exhortation to its adoption.

[4] It is difficult to comprehend how one of the last editors of this epistle can

than the Epistle of Barnabas, when Christians had already spread abroad in larger numbers in all 'Greek and Barbarian cities,' were living everywhere in calm assurance though amidst persecution, and could, indeed, regard themselves as everywhere the soul of the world.[1] Moreover, Christians at that time felt themselves already so completely separated from the Judeans, and so perfectly independent, that the generation then living seemed scarcely to know and to observe their original connection with them, save as the persecutions of the Christians which the Judeans indulged in reminded them forcibly enough that the Judeans still regarded them as legally belonging to their Community and as faithless apostates from it. This peculiar condition of things shows plainly that the book was published before the war of Hadrian. For the Judeans had then become once more full of arrogance, regarded all their ancient laws as still in force,[2] and therefore fiercely attacked the Christians if they (as was the case with most) declined, even as Jewish Christians, any longer to adhere to them,[3] which, as we shall see below, accords with the character of this interval only; so that we may on that ground also suppose that the author wrote about 120–130 A.D. He was evidently of Heathen extraction, and intended to write in the first instance for Gentiles only. His mind lived wholly in the Christianity which Paul had first preached to the world; indeed, in him there seemed to be no other than Paul himself come back to life to speak to this age, while many of his ideas and sayings are like echoes of John's. The Diognetus to whom he addressed the epistle was a man of distinction, who probably subsequently became one of the teachers of the young Marcus Aurelius, and who then, notwithstanding, probably helped to inspire the future emperor with the prejudices against Christianity from which he never afterwards got free.[4] Diognetus had also in

again, following that early error, ascribe it to Justin, whose literary style is wholly different; even supposing its earlier date had not been in the way of his authorship.

[1] As appears from capp. 5, 6.

[2] Just as the Judean Rabbis of that time looked upon all their *sacra* as still existing, *ante*, p. 40, and as Josephus often describes, *Contra Ap.* i. 1, 7, 12, ii. 6, 7, 23 (comp. also capp. 8, 9), everything Judean—country, sacrifices, Temple, &c.—as still existing unchanged, so our book, cap. 3, and the Epistle of Barnabas speak of the Judean *sacra* as if they were still existing; which suits best the interval previous to the war of Hadrian, and is what we also find in the Gospel of John.

[3] Capp. 4, 5. All these descriptions would have no meaning after the war of Hadrian; and there is not a trace in the book of its having been written during that war, as the phrase ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ὡς ἀλλόφυλοι πολεμοῦνται, cap. 5, does not presuppose an actual war.

[4] As we may infer from the first book of the *Thoughts of M. Aurelius*, cap. 6: for to the emperor Christians were really Goetæ.

his own youth, probably only from want of belief, said in a book that he had in vain taken great pains to understand the nature and origin of Christianity, and could not comprehend how this new Christian race, differing from both Heathen and Jews, could 'look down upon the world and despise death.'[1] Our author treats him as in earnest, and shows him with all the superiority of his mind and the lofty enthusiasm of his faith what were the fundamental errors of the Heathen and the Judeans, and what was the true character of Christians and of Christianity itself. Nothing could be said more simply or sincerely, and nothing more convincingly, and nothing could be marked by more decided faith, deep reflection, and mastery of the subject. We have here the seductive richness and artistic form of Greek rhetoric combined with the purest love of truth, the ease and charm of language allied with the inspiring seriousness of the Christian. And whilst the discourse begins with the most palpable and evident things of the senses, it leaves off with the most spiritual truths and loftiest ideas. It was not the place in an address to the wisest and best of the Heathen to refer to passages of the Old Testament or its interpretation; and the author, though it is his object to give a brief summary of the whole of Christianity, does not refer to any esoteric and secret doctrine; and as he certainly does not need the aid of allegory for the teaching of these highest truths, that system of interpretation is superfluous and unnecessary.[2]

3. *The Final Form of the Christian Hope.*

The Second Epistle of Peter.

If during these times, in spite of numerous restless and stormy efforts to introduce innovations, everything tended to greater repose and distinct finality in the fundamental views of Christianity, as if to allow the first great harvest of its existence and growth in the earth to ripen for the welfare of all mankind, it is, in the last place, quite in harmony with this, that now a greater degree of calm consolidation should be attained in that sphere especially which during the whole Apostolic age had been the most tumultuous with trembling expectation and excitement—that, namely, of the primitive Christian hope. One half of the whole of Christian life was at first made up of

[1] The language cap. 1 is so particular and at the same time in such a form that we do best to suppose it is taken from a book by Diognetus.

[2] See *ante*, p. 117.

the final hope which was the most intense expectation and embraced the end of all things in happy faith.[1] For, as in a moment, all the Messianic hopes had been wakened afresh by the rise of Christianity, in the confident expectation that the Christ who had appeared would immediately fulfil them. The very soil of the whole Apostolic age pulsated with the constant longing expectation of his coming in glory to hold the general judgment upon the world, to take his own to himself, and to openly begin his kingdom as that which was then becoming triumphant in the earth. Those who had been touched by him and his spirit were already conscious of their immortality; those also of their ranks who might have died in this period were regarded only as asleep until the trumpet of the judgment[2] should awake them for their glorification. But as the difference between the existing state of things and the glorification of all things in the fully consummated Messianic kingdom could not be overlooked, very early the more definite notion arose that all who would be alive when Christ should suddenly come, would in the same moment be glorified, that is clothed with a more spiritual body like that of the glorified Christ, and that rising thus from this dull earth, they would meet their Lord coming in the clouds, to remain with him thenceforth in their glorified condition.[3]

Thus the ancient hopes had in the early Apostolic age been immediately and rapidly Christianised; and as in Christian circles, where everything was straitened by calamity and all infinite concerns were most vividly felt, every heart was intensely expectant, at that time the Christian hope generally must have possessed its greatest inwardness and certainty, and as animated by the strongest feelings have beheld its fulfilment close at hand. Within the generation then living, at all events, it was believed, everything would be fulfilled; and if Christ himself left the day and the hour, that is the exact time, of the fulfilment to the Father alone, and taught his disciples to leave it to Him, he had nevertheless as certainly pointed to an early fulfilment of all the Messianic hopes.[4] The marvellously vivid reality and the inward certainty of this hope in its full extent had been thus one of the two respiratory acts of the entire Apostolic age; and when it had gradually subsided

[1] See vol. vii. pp. 105 sq.

[2] The figure is here, as formerly in Isa. xxvii. 13, taken from the year of jubilee, see *Antiquities*, p. 374; for as this year had long ceased to be an actual fact, a greater year was looked for at the end of the world, as is shown also by 'Isa.' lxi. 2.

[3] See my *Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus*, pp. 23, 27 sq. 47 sq. 207 sq.

[4] See *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, pp. 330 sq. (2nd ed. pp. 407 sq.)

a little during the course of that age, John, the author of the Apocalypse (not the apostle) once more fanned it into its original flame—indeed, he was the first to undertake the task of bringing into one connected whole the vast variety of Messianic hopes which were found in the different books of the Old Testament and were revived by the actual sayings of Christ and the Christian spirit.[1] But already the dangers which this earliest development of the Christian hope involved were too obvious to be unheeded, and after the destruction of Jerusalem they came more and more to the front.

People might be misled so as to bring forward such prophecies of the Old Testament as had in their true significance no relation to the Christian hope, or as had long ago been fulfilled in their primary sense. Thus the true prophets had before the first destruction of Jerusalem foretold a *return* of the members of the nation of Israel dispersed among the Heathen, and this prophecy was in their case most closely connected with the general expectation that a new kingdom of Israel would be gathered in their native country. As far as this prophecy had a real and immediate sense, it was fulfilled, as far as this was possible, at the beginning of the second building of Jerusalem. Amongst the Christian hopes, therefore, it had no longer any direct significance; and John, the author of the Apocalypse, assigns this prophecy no place in his book, although he interweaves all Old Testament anticipations admitting of a Christian application into his great wreath of predictions. When after the second destruction of Jerusalem circumstances similar to those after the first seemed to recur for the Judeans, Judean authors might indeed be tempted to revive that prophecy, as we know was done in the case of the Apocalypse of Ezra.[2] But in the case of the Christian hope, as long as it remained sound and intelligible, it was necessary that a clear distinction should be made as to this matter. Similarly Jeremiah might prophesy that the Levites would never be wholly absent in the true kingdom of Jahveh, and would become powerful again notwithstanding the decline of the kingdom of Israel at that time,[3] for

[1] I have explained this connected whole, after my *Comment. in Apoc.*, in detail in the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* viii. pp. 78 sq. and more recently in my *Johanneische Schriften*, vol. ii.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 47 sq. This book alludes in the passage concerning the Messiah, xiii. 12, 13, 39–47, to the return of the Ten Tribes, using the passage Isaiah xi. 15, 16, comp. vol. v. pp. 90 sq. But this description, like the whole of the original Apocalypse of Ezra, has nothing whatever of a Christian nature in it; the Messiah is delineated in it entirely after the Book of Enoch, which is one proof that the latter book is as old as I have supposed vol. vi. pp. 112 sq. This book follows here the *Ascension of Moses*, iii–v.

[3] Jer. xxxiii. 20–22.

in his day worship without them seemed an impossibility, and seven centuries had to pass away after his death before a higher Divine possibility in this respect was revealed as absolutely certain. And it is the sign of imperfect Christianity when the author of the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* seeks nevertheless to retain verbatim such an expectation amongst Christian hopes.

Further, there are traditional *figures* of Old Testament prophecy which, as an important truth had once been incorporated in them in connection with the Messianic hopes, were necessarily assigned a place amongst the Christian expectations, and which, as traditionally sacred, could easily become too stereotyped and be too scrupulously conceived. To these belongs especially the figure of Antichrist, which, after the Book of Daniel, had become so traditional that it passed at once as a matter of course into the cycle of Christian conceptions, and has, both in Paul's writings[1] and in the Apocalypse, a necessary place amongst these prophetic anticipations. But this figure, as far as it had a valuable significance, soon occupied a much more important place in Christianity than in the religion of the Old Testament. Christianity took up the conflict with Heathenism as far more earnest and inevitable than it had seemed to Judaism; the latter withdrew from Heathenism the more it discovered its own inability to overcome it. Christianity accordingly symbolised in the one Antichrist its conflict with Heathenism in its full power and terrible nature. And Antichrist appears in the Apocalypse of the New Testament delineated in this its terrible significance. Nevertheless, this, like every other such figure of the prophetic imagination, may be easily misunderstood and still more wrongly employed, and it loses its entire force as soon as the outward form of it alone is considered. The mortal combat to the near approach of which the Apocalypse had pointed Christian faithfulness and patience, had now arrived, and yet Heathenism as a world-wide force still remained unconquered, and Antichrist had not been seen in sensible form. And thus it became a great gain that the Apostle John in the light of his loftier mind very soon gave a higher significance to this as to so many other Christian conceptions, and after his manner briefly taught that though Antichrist was still to be expected, there might be equally well many Antichrists, and that such had then already appeared in the midst of the Christian Church.[2]

[1] See *Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus*, p. 28. [2] 1 John ii. 18–23, iv. 3; 2 John, ver. 7.

In like manner very definite views regarding *cycles of time*, in which everything hoped for would gradually reach its full consummation, had long been formed. It had, indeed, always been the confident belief of the great prophets of the Old Testament, that the last conceivable salvation was variously conditioned, and could, therefore, be only gradually consummated. But two things afterwards led to a more definite conception of a fixed period between the first and the final stage of the general consummation, in accordance with certain round numbers of universal validity. These two things were, first, that in the course of the centuries it had become more and more clear that there were great hindrances in the way which must be first overcome, and that the fulfilment of the final hope was being perpetually deferred; secondly, that for these reasons the ages and changes of human history generally came to be more and more mapped out with reference to their vast spaces and cycles.[1] The favourite idea was that according to Gen. i. in combination with Psalm xc. 4 the duration of the present creation would be 7,000 years, and that the last thousand years of that period, as the Sabbatical millennium, would be the time of the first great Messianic victories before the beginning of a new and glorified creation.[2] This hope was undoubtedly worked out before the time of Christ in a widely read book, and thus passed into Christian circles. But it is perilous to conceive thus a long interval during which the Divine victory is to be completely won and calmly enjoyed on the earth, while yet a far higher and quite different state of blessedness is to be looked for later on. Here and there in Christian circles the most extravagant material images which might be referred to this Sabbatic interval were collected from prophetic books of all kinds, and were even confounded with Christ's own words.[3] But men of cooler minds felt from the beginning a horror of all this; and though the author of the New Testament Apocalypse, for good reasons, interweaves the hope of a *millennium* of this kind into the wreath of Christian expectations, he does it without any extravagant pictures and symbols.[4]

[1] See vol. v. p. 348; vol. vi. pp. 55 sq.

[2] Comp. on this point my *Johanneische Schriften* ii. pp. 324–26; and the remarks above, p. 51.

[3] Thus the extravagant figures and conceptions in which Papias revelled according to Irenæus v. 33 and Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 39. 12, as if they had been uttered by Christ, were really taken at first from 2 Bar. cap. 29, comp. capp. 36, 73 sq., as I observed in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1867, p. 1715.

[4] Comp. my *Johanneische chriften* ii. pp. 322 sq.

But the most dangerous thing of all was the reaction of coldness and indifference which at length followed the first fervour of these hopes. When the first generation of Christians with most of the Apostles had now passed away, and yet Christ did not appear in his glory and the great triumph of his followers had not been secured—when, after the destruction of Jerusalem, everything settled down into a new long and sluggish calm, which was broken only by the persecutions of the Christians—in these circumstances a gloomy despair fell upon many Christians, and the more thoughtless turned coldly away from all Christian hopes that had hitherto been held. These were in most cases the Christians who preferred to base their salvation upon the new fancies of their own narrow intellects[1] rather than upon a sympathetic understanding of the great truths that had been communicated. If there were such sceptics five or ten years after the destruction of Jerusalem, as we have seen,[2] it may be easily supposed that their number and their audacity would increase in the decades immediately following, when such doubts might seem to be amply confirmed by experience. An actual refutation of them and the statement of a satisfactory view in opposition to them grew more and more a necessity; and this was done at last in good time in a book which has still its place in the New Testament as one of the last epistles, and which can be properly appreciated from this point of view only.

This is the *Second Epistle of Peter*, as it has been called since its reception into the New Testament, an epistle which bears plainer marks than any similar one of having been written and sent forth by an anonymous author in the name of a great apostle, for pretty much the same reasons as induced other excellent Christians about this time to avail themselves of a literary artifice of this description, as was observed in a general way above.[3] In his work this writer made very free use of the Epistle of Jude, the date and object of which were examined above,[4] appropriating almost all its main thoughts, and repeating them almost verbatim.[5] Indeed, unless he wished to publish in his own name an entirely new and independent epistle for the instruction of his contemporaries, he could not do better. The Epistle of Jude had already dealt with almost the same doubts regarding the coming of Christ in

[1] *Ante*, pp. 127 sq.
[2] *Ante*, pp. 127 sq.
[3] *Ante*, p. 106.
[4] *Ante*, pp. 140 sq.
[5] It may easily be perceived and shown that the Epistle of Jude was not taken from our epistle.

his glory and the universal judgment connected with it, and it was aimed at the same false Gnostics against whom our author wished to speak; and it contained very much that was still most appropriate to be said on the matter. But a considerable time had elapsed, and the Epistle of Jude had not completely effected its object; false doubters had since grown more numerous and more daring in the Church, especially in certain quarters, and a more powerful voice than that of Jude's was needed. According to all indications we may very well suppose that our author did not resolve to do something publicly against these unsatisfactory Christians of his time until some twenty years after the publication of the Epistle of Jude, when Jude himself had long been dead, and his epistle was no longer much heeded by many.[1] In these circumstances it was a very suitable thing to do to reproduce in this way and send out afresh the essential part of that epistle; and as our author attached no importance whatever to the charm that might belong to his own ideas or to the honour of a literary name, but desired solely to contribute what he could to promote the Christian cause, he could the more easily take that earlier epistle as the basis of the chief portion of his own. And all the other indications enable us easily to discover the origin of our epistle. The author, animated by the pure desire to serve the great cause of Christianity, writes, it is true, with great skill from the standpoint of the life and thought of Peter, as far as he was able to translate himself with vivid reality into them, which he was necessitated to do by the plan of his book. He writes as if Peter shortly before his death, and with the distinct expectation of its nearness, once more addressed himself to Christians with most affectionate exhortation.[2] But while he writes thus he takes so little pains to imitate closely in his own epistle the previous epistle of Peter which was really written by the apostle,[3] and which our author was undoubtedly acquainted with,[4] that his language and style are entirely different. The real Epistle of Peter is simple in its language and style, while our epistle is written in a rhetorical, involved, and often artificially laboured

[1] It is remarkable that the phrase *μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες*, Josephus, *Ant.* pref. § 4, is repeated 2 Pet. i. 16. [Dr. Abbott, *The Expositor*, Jan. 1882, and Archdeacon Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, p. 106, have since shown how extensive the similarities between Josephus and the author of 2 Peter are.]

[2] According to the meaning of the passage 2 Pet. i. 12–15. The plan of the work in this respect is therefore the same as in the book of Ecclesiastes, where Solomon is introduced as speaking shortly before his death, whilst in the Book of Wisdom (see vol. v. pp. 479 sq.) he speaks, in accordance with its purpose, as king in the midst of his best years.

[3] See vol. vii. pp. 462 sq.

[4] 2 Pet. iii. 1.

style; the author, as a Christian who had enjoyed a learned education, interweaving even the favourite sacred number seven into the thread of his discourse.[1] We can still plainly discover why he preferred to write his epistle in Peter's name rather than in Paul's, though his mind was more akin to the latter. When he undertook his work, a subordinate purpose with him was to say a good word for the epistles of Paul, which must then have been widely distributed in a collected form and largely read. Some things in those epistles had been superficially understood and falsely applied by the Gnostics especially, as we have seen;[2] we do not now know what the exact details in question were, but as our author had so clearly perceived the bad use that was being made of these epistles, he determined on this opportunity to give his warning against the misuse of them, while at the same time he warmly commended them, as they deserved, to all Christians.[3] But that could be best done by introducing, not Paul himself, but his great colleague, Peter, as the speaker; and this was undoubtedly one chief reason which led him to write the epistle in Peter's name. Indeed, a word of commendation on this matter was admirably adapted to prevent many useless contentions of those times, and to aid the amicable adjustment of all Christian views. And the anonymous author might be firmly convinced that he had said nothing which Peter himself, had he been alive, would not have said in some such form and by the weight of his name decisively settled.[4]

After the manner of the epistles of Paul, the author makes Peter announce by an elevated introduction the chief subject of the letter,[5] speaks then mainly in the words of the Epistle of Jude against the Gnostics,[6] and turns last to his essay on the Christian hope which was denied by pseudo-philosophic Christians of that class,[7] closing with an appended word with reference to the epistles of Paul. The part of the epistle peculiarly

[1] In the passage 2 Pet. i. 5-7 seven virtues, with love as their climax, are enumerated as following step by step from the first fundamental virtue of faith; the number seven is not expressly mentioned, but it is evidently intended, which is not surprising in such a writer and at that time.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 133 sq.

[3] 2 Pet. iii. 14-18.

[4] The same endeavour to present the two greatest apostles, who had both met their end in Rome, as at last of the same mind, was some time later prosecuted with stronger means by the narrative work of the *Preaching of Paul* (vol. vii. p. 460), which was at one time largely read and is probably the same work as the *Preaching of Peter* (according to the fragments in Clement's *Strom.* i. 29, ii. 15, vi. 5, 6, 15, and Origen's *Comment. in Joan.* tom. xiii. 17, who quotes from Heracleon), as both apostles are introduced as speakers in it.

[5] Ch. i., where as in ch. iii. the language most characteristic of and peculiar to this author is found.

[6] Ch. ii.

[7] Ch. iii. 1–13.

the author's own is, therefore, in addition to this appended remark on the epistles of Paul, to be found mainly in this essay on the Christian hope, and it is only on this point that he contributes anything new. He reminds his readers of the great epochs in which the whole creation moves on, in order to rise from the destruction of one of its forms to a new and higher one, and that as the past creation, having arisen out of the chaos of water, perished by the deluge, so the existing world, with its fundamentally different constitution, may perish in a different way by fire, as if to be purified into a higher form by this more pungent element than water; and this conception of the destruction of the world by fire was particularly natural in those days.[1] This idea, as far as it is concerned with material matters, reveals rather the learned than the purely inspired writer; but the gaze of the reader is quite properly led away from the limited present into the immeasurable spaces of history, in which alone Christian hope, in proportion as it is deeply founded, can find its fulfilment; and when the author goes on to say that in Divine things, such as true Christian hopes are, narrow human periods must not be taken as the standard of measurement,[2] the proof of the truth of these hopes is fully presented.

Thus this epistle had its value in aiding the complete construction of Christian views and the lasting tranquillisation of the Christian mind, as it opened a glance into that vast eternity in which alone Christian hopes, precisely on account of their infinitely comprehensive nature, can be fulfilled. And yet this tranquillisation would have been a vain one unless all the past history of Christianity had amply supported those hopes, and had thus become a pledge of their fulfilment in the endless future. Happily this was the case, though our author does not consider it necessary to speak of it. Even the very first generation of Christians previous to the destruction of Jerusalem had not passed away without some fulfilment of the first burning hope of the Christians of a more sensible feeling of the coming of Christ in his glory; for when those first forty years were now after the destruction of Jerusalem looked back upon, it could be distinctly enough felt that the rejection of Christian

[1] As I have shown in my *Abhandlung über die Sibyll. Bücher*: it is not necessary to suppose that our author took his conception of the destruction of the world by fire in the first instance from the Greek philosophers. Suggestions of the idea were already to be found, Isa. i. 25, 31; l. 11; lxvi. 24; and elsewhere.

[2] 2 Pet. iii. 8, after Ps. xc. 4: our author also, though writing as late as the end of the first or the beginning of the second century, still in spirit follows closely in the line of the previous writers whose works appeared worthy of a place in the Canon.

truth had been terribly avenged on the Judeans, that the power of Christ's spirit had never left his followers amidst the deepest sufferings of that time, and that his Church was now rising in power to a new life from that extreme trial; all of which we have seen above.[1] The first great fulfilment of Christian hope had, therefore, already been actually experienced, and the prophecies of Christ himself had found their first confirmation for these first days. With the less difficulty, therefore, could the glance now be directed forwards into a far more extended period of time, and the more easy was it to perceive what was essential or unessential in the outward form of all prophetic utterances with reference to the eternal Christian hope.

Even the truest prophecy, not excepting that of Christ himself, Matt. xxiv. xxv., must always find both its attestation and historical limitation in the strict course of the development of its fundamental thought. This can be seen nowhere more plainly than in the utterances of Christ regarding his return in glory. It will take place only in circumstances that are entirely unlike those of the time of Christ's earthly life, when his followers would feel his absence most painfully, and his enemies would be in greatest dread of him, and the fundamental conditions of the world as hitherto constituted would be completely altered—this is a fundamental idea of the prophecy of it. But the result showed that the prophecy might be something more than this and yet be still simply more wonderfully fulfilled, that is, in repeated preludes and anticipatory signs before its last and most marked fulfilment, inasmuch as every moment at which the world must involuntarily and yet most sensibly feel his truth and power brings him again in his glory to the world, as it were, and as near to it as possible. And if the prophecy limited this return to the extent of the duration of that generation, as one which must necessarily be made acquainted with it, this was so perfectly justified that the first (and as the first the most important of its kind) beginning of it was made in the Resurrection.[2] If Christ's prophecy in these chapters seems to place the end too near (and yet, in relation to the inner necessity and truth of the matter, it was not too near), it appears to put it too far off when he says, that not an atom of the Law shall pass away 'until heaven and earth pass away, until all things be accomplished.'[3] And yet this also is in appearance only, as we see from the use of identical figures in each case. For the passing away of heaven and

[1] *Ante*, pp. 25 sq. [2] See vol. vii. pp. 45 sq.
[3] See on this passage, *ante*, p. 147.

earth can surely in this prophecy only signify, as in the earlier passage, the complete transformation of the existing and the beginning of the perfect world, since this phrase has as its equivalent the other—'until all things be accomplished.' And this transformation in its highest or spiritual sense had already arrived with the age inaugurated by the first Pentecost; and if in his day Paul acted as if the Mosaic Law had no longer an outward binding force, he acted, strictly speaking, not prematurely; but this prophecy, as regards the Divine condition of things, was thereby fulfilled, and the Apostle might have appealed to this true view of the fulfilment of the utterances of Christ. But we must remember that it is more easy to perceive what is implied in a prophecy, and how far its true meaning has been fulfilled or not, when the light of history has shone upon it. And in these days we can form a calmer judgment on all these things than was very well possible in those early times.

2. *The Developed Form of the Christian Church.*

1. *The Dissolution of a Parent Church.*

The later Relatives of the Lord.

In proportion as Christianity now separated almost completely from the ancient Community, and sought its consolidation in conformity with its own special character and tendencies, the matters of chief importance were the regulation of its church-life and the position it had to take up in its permanent constitution in relation to the world at large. The Christian life is pre-eminently church-life, inasmuch as the individual finds his true place in it only as, under Christ as the eternal and unchangeable head of the Community, he embraces with the love of Christ all the brethren who already acknowledge him as the head, and regards all who do not yet acknowledge him as to be won over to him, in order that by their active work in the Church the Kingdom of God may be gradually consummated as the final end of Christianity; a view which Paul placed definitely before him, and sought to realise as far as he could.

But as Paul continued in his day still to regard the parent church at Jerusalem as at all events a chief centre of Christendom, to be acknowledged by all Christians with sincere love and sympathy, and as he revered the ancient Temple, close to which the parent church collected, the question now arose, whether, after the destruction of the Temple and the cessation

of the sacred usages and life closely connected with it, a parent church, with certain privileges, was still to be acknowledged by Christendom or not. This question reduced itself essentially to the further one, whether Christianity, as then extended throughout the world, needed a central locality somewhere in the earth, after the nature of the parent church at the time of Paul, when it represented the external unity of Christendom, though in a growingly loose form.

It is, however, easy to understand that questions of this kind could not at first be proposed and answered fully and distinctly immediately after the great commotions of the war with Rome. On the contrary, as after every sudden calamity of this kind the victims of it seek by the law of counterbalance to rise again as soon as possible, and as we saw[1] that even the ancient Community endeavoured, in the period immediately following the destruction of the Temple, to recover itself as much as possible, so now we find the Christian parent church trying to collect itself afresh and take up its previous position. It was only to avoid the cruelty and destructive tendencies of the Judeans that it had fled to Pella.[2] Why should it, therefore, not seek to recover its former position on the cessation of the war? Though the Temple had fallen, the ancient sacred territory remained the same, with all its hopes and expectations, which were shared by the Christians, as they were then perpetuated in their first freshness and original form. It is true, detailed information regarding this recovery is now wanting; neither do we know in what form and under what conditions the new government allowed a Christian church to meet again amid the ruins of Jerusalem, nor whether really Jerusalem was its chief seat, as formerly, or whether, at first, at all events, it simply kept as near Jerusalem as possible.[3] But the important fact is certain that a Christian church which took its name from Jerusalem was once more collected, as if it was still felt to be a necessity that at least a part of the Christian Church should await in the locality of the ancient hope the coming of Christ in his glory.[4]

We are by no means warranted in supposing that this revived church of Jerusalem was influenced by one-sided Jewish-Christian views—a supposition which is not remotely sanctioned by the Epistle of Jude, the only literary memento of this church.[5] It is true, we know as a fact that the fourteen

[1] *Ante*, pp. 27 sq.
[2] Vol. vii. p. 526.
[3] The account in Epiphanias, *De Mensur. et Ponder.* cap. 15, is at all events very meagre.
[4] See *ante*, p. 147.
[5] See *ante*, pp. 140 sq.

'bishops' of this church, who came between James, who fell as a martyr, A.D. 63,[1] and the restoration of Jerusalem under Hadrian, were all circumcised, and of Judean descent;[2] but this is amply explained by the fact that this church was to be the continuation of the parent church. However, there was another thing which, according to all indications, contributed to the revival of this church, and something which was of decisive importance. As James the Just had been made the first elder of the parent church, evidently partly because he was the brother of the Lord, so, undoubtedly, many of the most faithful believers now thought that one reason why this church ought to be kept up was that there were still near relatives of the Lord to whom the undoubted honour was due of remaining at the head of the Christians at the ancient sacred spot. Jude, the author of the epistle, was undoubtedly, as the sole surviving brother of the Lord, raised to the position of one of the Elders immediately after the stoning of James, and held this position for a considerable time after the destruction of the Temple, as we must infer from his epistle. Afterwards another near kinsman of the Lord was spoken of, who at last met martyrdom as a similar Elder. As a martyr he was more frequently mentioned, and popular legend at last, in Hegesippus, on account of the similarity of his death, always closely associated his name with that of James the Just, and made him his immediate successor.[3] This is Symeon, the son of Clopas, a near relative of Christ,[4] who was crucified, at a very advanced age, in the reign of Trajan. For, however harmless might be the honour

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 456-sq.

[2] Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 5 compared with cap. 6. All these fourteen 'bishops' of Jerusalem after James as the first are enumerated by name: Eusebius found this list of the fourteen bishops of Jerusalem in existence, but nothing regarding the length of the time during which each held his office. He does not say where he found the list, and we have no reason for ascribing it to Hegesippus, although in his account also Symeon follows immediately after James. We have in Eusebius a Judas quite at the end; therefore, according to this list also, the Jude who wrote the epistle would not be the immediate successor of James; but undoubtedly this means simply that he was not regarded as the first of the elders, or as the bishop, of his time, because, after James' violent death, that was not deemed advisable for the church, just as after the stoning of Stephen the apostles ceased to be heads of the church (vol. vii. p. 166). The memory of these fifteen first circumcised bishops of Jerusalem, with Judas as the last of them, has been preserved even in Abulfatch's *Ann. Sam.* p. 159. 10–12; only they are there called *disciples of Christ*, comp. *ante* p. 156. On the other hand, Eutychius, *Ann.* I. p. 345. 49, 51, enumerates only Symeon, Juda, and زكشاوس, probably a corruption of Zacchæus.

[3] According to the accounts in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 32, comp. iii. 11, 22, 35; iv. 22.

[4] See vii. p. 121; Epiph. *Hær.* lxxviii. 14. According to the *Chron. Pasch.* I. 471 he would have fallen as a martyr A.D. 105, in the reign of Trajan; but according to this Chronicle the deaths of all the great celebrities of that period happened in the year 104–5: of John (*ante* p. 169), of Clement, of the apostle Simon Cananites (who is said to be the same as *Judas Jacobi*), of the above Simon, and of Ignatius.

of being the head of the parent church of that day, which was accorded to the relatives of the Lord, this relationship cannot have remained unnoticed and unsuspected in Rome at the imperial court. We discover this most plainly in the reminiscence:[1] that Domitian was alarmed by the report that some of the descendants of David were still living in Palestine; that he accordingly caused two grandchildren of the Lord's brother Jude[2] to be brought to him at Rome by an armed officer of justice, that he might there have them executed; that they also confessed in Rome, without reservation, that they were descendants of David, and when questioned as to their property could only reply that they possessed both together only one small field,[3] which they tilled with their own hands, and the yearly produce of which was only 9,000 *denarii*, from which they had to pay all the taxes; that the hard skin of their hands showed only too plainly the truth of their statements; and that when they had been further asked who Christ was, and what his kingdom was, and they had replied that it was not earthly but celestial and angelical, and would not come until the end of time, Domitian began to despise the poor, simple people, ordered them to be set at liberty, and afterwards refrained from persecuting the Christians. This reminiscence is undoubtedly historical, and is of a piece with the whole policy of the Flavians.[4] It confirms the view that Judas was once looked upon as an Elder of the church at Jerusalem, as it adds that the Christians rewarded the steadfastness of his grandchildren by making them bishops (that is, conferring on them the honour of elders); for unless the relatives of the Lord had previously been distinguished by an honour of this kind, no such idea of their being dangerous could have found its way to Rome, and have furnished ground for the charge of treason against them. We can thus understand why the church of Jerusalem should afterwards avoid the election of a member of the family of Jude, and resort to Symeon, a more remote relative of Christ's; and, according to all indications, this elder met with his death in another way. For we have good reason for believing the story[5] that 'heretics'

[1] From Hegesippus *apud* Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 20, 21; and iii. 32. On the other hand, Tertullian, who is quoted by Eusebius, does not speak, *Apol.* cap. 5, distinctly of grandsons of Judas.

[2] The names of these two, Zoker and Jacobus, have been preserved in the *Eclogæ Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ*, ed. J. Cramer, tom. ii. of his *Anecdotæ Græcæ* (Oxon. 1839), p. 88.

[3] A field of 39 *plethra* or Roman *jugera*, as is definitely stated; a denarius was then worth about 6*d*. Hegesippus, who had been in Rome, likes to introduce Roman expressions into his narrative.

[4] See *ante*, p. 78.

[5] After Hegesippus in the principal

accused him as a relation of Christ's before the Roman governor of Syria, Atticus, in the reign of Trajan, and thus brought about his crucifixion. By these heretics we may suppose those are intended who denied the actual appearing of a human Christ as the Messiah,[1] who could not, therefore, greatly respect supposed relatives of such a Messiah, but rather dreaded serious injury to their own churches from the supremacy of such people. And according to other indications the animosity between the various sects of the Church was very strong at that time. When a man was charged before the Romans by those who professed themselves to be Christians with claiming, as a relative of Christ, supremacy, they could not easily remit the punishment of death which had been attached to such crimes since the time of Vespasian. But Symeon endured his sufferings most patiently for several days, so that even before his death on the cross he called forth the highest admiration of the Roman governor, especially on account of his heroic endurance at his advanced age. And we may gather from the brief terms of office of the other fourteen bishops how troubled and trying their position was: the average term was scarcely five years.

After Symeon's martyrdom we hear no more of any other relatives of Christ being raised to similar dignities, or even of their existence; and an institution disappeared which, though it might have a meaning in lower religions and commonwealths, such as Islam, had in Christianity no true significance from the very first, as was fully shown as early as Paul's day. Christianity, being the eternally necessary and purely divine claim on men and the community of all acknowledging that claim, was from the very first superior to all such limited human expedients and supports; so that the few innocent experiments of this kind that were at first attempted here and there necessarily soon disappeared. Moreover the very existence and reputation of a parent church were early lost, either for the reason that in the Holy Land the Jewish-Christian churches were gradually consolidated,[2] and on that account more and more cut themselves off from Christendom at large, which had long spread throughout all countries, or for the reason that at last and in due time the idea of the true Church

passage in Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 32. But this derivation of the treachery from αἱρετικῶν τινες occurs again in the case of the two grandsons of Jude, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 19, where it is not necessary, and as far as we can see, Hegesippus said nothing about it. We see from this that Jude and his family were afterwards confounded with Symeon; a point to be carefully noted in connection with Eusebius' combination of all these various reminiscences. Comp. also my remarks, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1867, pp. 1425 sq.

[1] *Ante*, p. 137.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 144 sq.

was correctly unfolded in the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians; and by means of this letter very soon obtained general prevalence.

The Epistle to the Ephesians: the Idea of the True Church.

This epistle, which, though not extensive, rivals in importance and truth all those that were at last collected in the New Testament, is so important for the age before us and all succeeding ages because it presents for the first time the true conception of the Community or Church of Christ, and in glowing language renders the idea of it imperishable. In fact, prior to this period following the dissolution of the Ancient Community and the great further development which the New Community exhibited both before and after that dissolution, it was not possible or necessary that the full and true idea of the Christian Community, or rather of the Community of Christ, should be presented and established as necessary in opposition to all contemporary errors and misconceptions. For though the primary bases of a community of the true religion had been unalterably laid for all time by Christ himself,[1] since then two new questions of most serious moment had arisen, which had now to be finally settled. On the one hand, in consequence of Paul's great work, and the unwearied labours of his successors, the Heathen had adopted Christianity in such large numbers and throughout so many countries that the centre of gravity of Christian activity and energy had been thereby entirely changed, and the question arose with greater urgency whether the parent church, even in the limited sense in which Paul had recognised it, was to be acknowledged by the whole of Christendom. On the other hand, the Church founded by Christ necessarily acquired after his glorification an entirely different importance from what it possessed when he was living on the earth in its midst; as a fact, it possessed this new significance in the highest sense from the very commencement of the Apostolic age.[2] In the Apostolic age, however, the dignity of the glorified Christ's relation to his Church had been determined rather by the immediate feeling of the moment than by mature reflection, and could now at last be most correctly ascertained, together with all the consequences involved in this question; and there had been in Christendom at this time sufficient experiences passed through to permit a perfectly satisfactory view to be formed of all these matters.

[1] Vol. vi. pp. 296 sq.

[2] Vol. vii. pp. 53 sq.

It is very remarkable that the Apostle John, who from the weight of his Apostolic reputation and deliverances would naturally have been the proper person to propound the true idea of the Church of Christ, at this time never mentions the name of the Church in the larger sense.[1] Not that the mind of the Apostle John would have been out of sympathy with this higher idea of the Church, which had now become a necessity; on the contrary, all the elements required for its conception found a place in his heart, for he makes a marked antithesis between Christ and the world, creating for the former the new expressive denomination, *the Saviour of the world*,[2] and saying emphatically that he was the propitiation, not of our sins only, but also of those of the whole world.[3] Hence from the reminiscences of Christ's life on earth he now brings forward with special emphasis some sayings and deeds of Christ, unnoticed in the earlier Gospels, because they might most plainly attest that the salvation of the Gentiles was in accord with Christ's whole spirit, and that many Gentiles even then exhibited a deep appreciation of Christ's cause.[4] Still, in this as in other matters the mind of John appears too profoundly absorbed in immediate duty, and in the memory of the character and life of Christ, to permit him to propound a new view, which would either be easily inferred by intelligent persons, or which could not be propounded at an earlier moment in the form in which it required now to be expressed. Paul, too, had laboured too much under the direct influence of the great cause to which he had devoted his life to allow him to propound many reflections upon it. But he, more than any other man, had founded the majority of the churches which were now flourishing, and which ought, in accordance with his feeling, to be joined in a higher unity; and when the whole of the churches which had thus arisen were after his death first reviewed in their wide extent it was natural and fitting that one of his most capable disciples or successors should give full expression to the truth with regard to this point. But such a disciple of Paul's now saw before him two possible ways of presenting this truth for the first time to the whole of Christendom. He might utter it in his own name, in which case he would be compelled to present

[1] The name ἐκκλησία occurs only 3 John, vv. 6, 9, 10, and is here used only of a local church.

[2] 1 John iv. 14, likewise John iv. 42. The use of σωτήρ itself in this sense occurs in Paul's writings once only, in the late epistle, Phil. iii. 20, and then incidentally; but it is very frequent in all writings after the destruction of the Temple.

[3] 1 John ii. 2.

[4] The narratives John iv. 4–42, xii. 20–23, and sayings like x. 16, xvii. 17–22, are of this class.

it as a Christian teacher merely, like any other of his time, and to establish it at length as well as he was able. For even the most distinguished and capable men of the second generation fell far below the elevation of an apostle in the work of expounding and defending the truths of Christianity. They attained merely the position of teachers; whilst the word of an apostle, with its conciseness, incisiveness, and direct certainty, was regarded as having a Divine and prophetic force. The men of the second generation were hardly, therefore, able to speak to the existing churches in any other form than that of the Epistle to the Hebrews,[1] or of the so-called Epistle of Barnabas.[2] It was only apostles and men like Paul, John, James, and Peter, who participated from the beginning in the original fire of Christian life without the visible Christ, and were still directly inspired by Christ himself, who could occupy this unique position in regard to other men. Their utterances accordingly as the founders and guides of churches had something of the prophetic character about them, and they were able to establish the truths they uttered rather by direct assurances as from God than by elaborate discussions. This was now no longer expected from the successors of the apostles, and when they wrote in their own names it was not as from such a Divine height. At the same time, many a teacher of this class might have good reason for supposing that he could speak to Christendom in the name of a Paul; and the true doctrine of the Church in its highest sense was undoubtedly one that could be best handled from an elevation corresponding to its high nature.

We have here accordingly the first instance of an anonymous disciple and friend of Paul writing and publishing an epistle in the apostle's name, simply in order that he might be able in this manner to teach in a more effective way something to his contemporaries which might have been taught in another form. In view of many necessities of the Christian Church at the time, Paul had undoubtedly been taken from it almost too soon; and how many in those first years of the new state of things must have intensely longed to hear his voice of incomparable force and truth with regard to pressing questions of the day. And it is as if our author had intensely desired to hear that apostle pour out his heart as regards the true Church who more than any other had laboured to create it, and had borne it upon his heart before it had become so great and glorious as it then was; and it is as if he had then by profound meditation

[1] See vol. vii. pp. 476 sq. [2] See *ante*, pp. 108 sq.

realised how Paul would have spoken on the question if he had been called on then to speak on it to his contemporaries. It was itself a great art to be able to speak to Christendom in the name of Paul; and our author accordingly sought to rise as far as possible to the elevation of feeling characteristic of a Paul, in order that he might be able to speak for thousands of longing readers regarding the significance and dignity of the Church of Christ with the same truth and comprehensive clearness with which Paul himself would have spoken if he had been alive. We have seen in earlier portions of this work that it had long been a much practised art in the ancient Community to study the spirit, thought, and style of an earlier prophet or saint, and then to speak in his name to the contemporary generation. It is undoubtedly in many respects a remarkable phenomenon that this practice should recur so early in the Christian Church, and especially that Paul's extraordinary spirit should be so soon called up, as it were, to complete the work of his earthly career; but it is by no means such a surprising phenomenon when we remember the increased fermentation and outward troubles which Christianity was then passing through; the state of things was such that no literary expedient and no art of discourse could be well left untried in order to teach in the most effective way what the exigencies of the time required. Moreover, by the gracious way in which he honoured others, e.g. Timothy, as joint authors of his epistles,[1] Paul had himself given a special justification for the further production of epistles in his name.

Indeed, the entire art of our epistle is directed substantially to the object of further carrying out, in accordance with the needs of the times, the hints which Paul had already given in one of his epistles. Generally, it is true, he does not yet speak in his epistles of the Church of Christ as embracing in one whole the individual churches. In the first instance it is only *the brethren, the saints, the elect,* that are present to his mind; and he barely speaks of the Church in that wide sense as an historical fact.[2] But when he had at length founded a rapidly growing number of 'churches of God' (as he still calls them), the idea of the one Church, which should in a higher sense embrace them all, necessarily grew ever wider as it arose before his mind. In the forced retirement of his last years there were few things so comforting to his mind as the idea of this unity of many single churches spread throughout all countries and

[1] See my *Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus*, pp. 9 sq.

[2] Gal. i. 13, where he still gives it the full designation *the Church of God*: but Phil. iii. 6 this name is in a similar connection shortened to *the Church* simply.

nations, rising before his vision like a many-membered spiritual body of one and the same invisible Christ as its celestial head. And this idea must again have presented itself most distinctly before his mind when he saw how this great unity, which was destined to receive into its peace and its salvation the whole world (as he had himself either learnt by experience or had good reason to expect), was in danger of being broken up by new and baseless divisions. In his Epistle to the Colossians accordingly, in view of the new disturbers of this unity, he had spoken for the first time [1] (or rather caused another to speak) of the Church as the body of Christ, its head,[2] in a connection in which his utterances soared to similar lofty ideas of the eternal significance of Christianity. It was one of the last and probably the only epistle of Paul's in which a new thought of this nature had been thrown out; it was accordingly now taken up by our anonymous author as the basis of his exposition. And if his endeavour to revive Paul's revered voice for the benefit of his age is for other reasons to be excused as a literary expedient, it finds its justification likewise in the fact that this new epistle is nothing more than an expansion of the fundamental thoughts which Paul had himself caused to be expressed in the Epistle to the Colossians, only that in this instance they of themselves almost fill an epistle, and are intended to be expanded in the same elevated spirit in which they had been originally uttered by Paul.[3] It is only here and there that passages from earlier epistles are present to the mind of our resuscitator of Paul.[4]

While therefore in the epistle which served as the foundation of this one, reference to new false teachers was one main object, or indeed the real occasion of it, that part of the original was now put wholly on one side, inasmuch as our author had simply to carry out more fully the idea of the Church of Christ. In the view of our author, however, the Church in this highest sense, as the grand celestial unity of all the single churches, is not simply what it was to Paul,[5] but is evidently far more; and he writes about it in conformity with a way of speaking of an entirely different origin. He looks upon it as founded long ago by the holy apostles and prophets upon the chief corner-stone, Christ,[6] as the instrument of the

[1] Col. i. 18, 24, comp. ii. 9, 10, 19.

[2] See my *Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus*, pp. 467 sq.

[3] The relation between the two epistles is therefore similar to that of the expanded Epistle of Ignatius to his own original one, see below.

[4] E.g. σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος, Eph. v. 23, comp. *ante*, p. 191.

[5] All that the author could borrow from the original epistle he brings forward at once, Eph. i. 22, 23.

[6] Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5; this form of expression could never have been used by

Divine wisdom, and the scene of the display of the Divine glory;[1] and he not only repeats, with various fresh elaborations, the earlier figure of the Church as the bride of Christ, but he seeks to adorn the figure by new allegorical applications and utterances of the Old Testament,[2] in which he would resemble the author of the Epistle of Barnabas if this use of allegory were not quite solitary and in his case simply an adornment of his other thoughts. But this lofty conception of the Church of Christ, according to which the Church is itself the sphere and the unity of all the highest spiritual aims and efforts,[3] receives its completion by the addition that it is capable of embracing equally all mankind, and that those who were Heathen are equally entitled to a place in it. This is a point which this epistle, like its model, insists upon with great emphasis. Yet, lofty and rich as this general description of the true Church and its Head is,[4] the author feels that it alone is not enough for a Christian epistle, and in a second half, accordingly, he adds the exhortations which arise out of those highest truths for all who desire to be living members of this Church of Christ,[5] and in doing this he makes use of the admirable hints supplied by his model.

But just as the epistle, contrary to Paul's manner, consists of two parts only, it also deviated from the genuine custom of the apostle in that it was not designed at all for any particular church, but for all Christendom. Though in its heading, therefore, the author gave it quite the form of a Pauline epistle, yet still he did not insert the locality of any particular church for which it was designed (for it might be designed for one as well as for another), in order that the omission might be supplied as required. But the blank was early filled up by some one inserting the name of the church at Ephesus.[6] With this the artificial character of the epistle was rendered complete, as everyone knew that Paul never wrote to all Christians generally, as had then become the growing custom.

But although somewhat more rhetorical in its style than

Paul himself, and is sufficient of itself to show that the epistle is of later date.

[1] Eph. iii. 10, 21: the first form of the expression, and one less liable to be misunderstood, was that the Church is 'the fulness of him (i.e. Christ, according to 1 Cor. xii. 4–11) who filleth all (all Christian gifts and works) in all (Christians),' Eph. i. 23 in free imitation of Col. ii. 10.

[2] Eph. v. 23–32: the expression *μυστήριον*, ver. 32, is of the nature of allegory, and the remark, *but I speak*, ver. 32, as opposed to other interpretations, is almost like what we meet with in the Epistle of Barnabas.

[3] This is the force of the sentence *πλήρωμα* &c. Eph. i. 23, as above explained.

[4] i–iii. the first half.

[5] iv–vi. after Col. iii. 5–iv. 6.

[6] This is the supposition we must make according to those ancient authorities (including the *Cod. Sin.*) which omit the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, Eph. i. 1: this supplement can have been found in one

was Paul's manner of writing, the epistle is on the whole well worthy of the name with which it opens, and, moreover, only further carries out, with Christian freedom (for there is not a trace in it of slavish imitation of the language of the apostle), an idea such as is in perfect harmony with the apostle's way of thinking. We are justified in supposing that it appeared between the years 75 and 80 A.D.[1] And when it appeared it evidently filled a gap in the general body of Christian ideas which had already made itself deeply felt; for it must early have been much read and received into a collection of the Pauline epistles. The true idea of the Church of Christ had been distinctly presented in it, and that idea was soon put forward in a similar manner in other epistles also.[2] But if the true nature of the Church of Christ is sketched in this epistle, it follows of itself that no further mention can be made of Jewish Christians in addition to it. And if with this Church its Head is so exalted, how is it possible to think any longer of earthly relatives of his as members of the Church, with any pre-eminence by virtue of their descent? This Church, though visible and corporeal, as consisting of individual Christians and separate churches, towers with its Head into the very heavens; and in the presence of this Head all its members, of whatever nation and race they may be, must be on a perfect equality.

2. *The Government of the Individual Churches and their Institutions.*

The Three Pastoral Epistles.

We have previously[3] described the internal constitution, membership, and government of the parent church, and also of the Gentile churches which followed its model. That constitution, with its various institutions, had been from the first the natural outcome of the rise and nature of a Christian church; it was itself so simple, and yet so adequate and necessary, that it remained essentially the same in the second and the third

original MS. only and not in others. The choice of this particular church as the one to which it could be most easily assigned was evidently made from a comparison of the passage, vi. 21, 22 (simply taken from Col. iv. 7, 8) with 2 Tim. iv. 12.

[1] It was written by another than the author of the three pastoral epistles, and follows much more closely and simply the real epistles of Paul: this great difference between it and the pastoral epistles shows that it was written before them. Moreover, it was found in Marcion's collection of Pauline epistles, while those three were wanting. It was also much earlier than the second of Peter, see *ante*, pp. 180 sq.

[2] E.g. 1 Tim. iii. 15. In conclusion it is hardly necessary to prove further from the manner and style of the epistle that its origin is to be sought in the Epistle to the Colossians and not immediately with Paul himself. Whoever is not blind in such matters will find the numerous arguments involved in the above considerations amply sufficient.

[3] Vol. vii. pp. 105 sq.

Christian generations. But the external situation of the separate churches now underwent rapid changes; the apostles and others who had founded the churches were quickly passing away, and the only one left of that hero-band—John—was little disposed to interfere in the inner relations of numerous churches. The parent church was fast losing its predominant authority and its influence over the various other churches that were continually growing in numbers and strength. In consequence of all this the independence of the separate churches, with regard to their own internal arrangements and their purely Christian affairs, was greatly on the increase, whilst the Heathen governments hardly paid any attention to their existence. On this very account numerous abuses might easily arise in connection with the new arrangements, though in themselves of a genuinely Christian nature; whilst it became the more difficult to correct them in a truly Christian and yet decided way in proportion as so few of the existing teachers could compare with the apostles. Moreover, the very existence of Christian churches in the world was as yet so new a thing, and had been so little consolidated, that it was not until the various churches now became more independent that it had to be shown in detail how they would take in hand their fuller consolidation upon the unchangeable foundations that had been laid once for all.

This entire period was therefore full of great commotion and fermentation in the midst of the churches themselves, and scarcely one of so many hundreds or thousands could enjoy a more peaceful development. For, in addition to all this, the above-named new heresies of all kinds were at the same time seeking to permeate and distract the churches; and the erroneous views and aims which they propagated necessarily powerfully affected in various ways the morals, and indeed the foundations, of the churches. It is true, we have no information as to all this from the midst of the various churches themselves, because they were still in a condition of nascent formation; so that the endlessly varied phases of their young life could not well be made the subject of historical description.[1]

[1] But in the case of the ancient metropolitan churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome, detailed accounts (as Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.*, shows) of the succession of their bishops were preserved; in which, of course, the mention of *Peter* as the first bishop of Rome, and of Antioch was only a later invention. That Mark was the first bishop of Alexandria down to 63 A.D. (Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 16, 24) has probably the same origin; for Barnabas, who was so closely connected with him (see vol. vii. pp. 344, 363) might be considered as holding that position, see *ante*, p. 111. Further traditions about Mark are considered in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1865, pp. 903 sq.

But very much that is important may be clearly gathered from special books which came out of the very midst of the noise of this agitation. They were written with the view of calming dangerous commotions of this kind, and undoubtedly produced a beneficial effect by pouring the soothing oil of true Christian exhortation and admonition upon these wild waves, and thus made preparation for a time of more peaceful development. Speaking generally, the new books with this object might be of two kinds, and of each kind some examples have been preserved; whence we may at this point anticipate the importance and beneficial effect of such writings. For writings of this kind were still always very brief, like all early Christian books, and, in the form in which they first appeared and were much read, made their way through the world simply as tracts or loose leaves. We may infer, therefore, that those which were preserved notwithstanding must have been on peculiarly weighty matters, and have owed their preservation to their intrinsic truth.

We have, first, in this connection epistles dealing with those questions of the time and resembling the Epistle to the Ephesians, which we have just been considering,[1] for, like that book, they owed their origin to the profound desire to hear the voice of a great apostle like Paul with regard to the new difficult questions; and they likewise are clothed in the garb of a Pauline epistle, in order once more to deliver what was now necessary to be said from an Apostolic elevation. We refer to the three *Pastoral Epistles*, the true origin and design of which can be duly appreciated from the necessities of this period alone. What are the characteristics of the true governors of the churches? What ought they to be as men, and what in relation to the various recent false teachers and false governors? Paul had been, either personally or by his friends and disciples, as it were, the father of almost all the numerous churches that had been formed amongst the Gentiles. At their foundation and organisation, and especially at the first appointment of their elders and other officers, he had given his apostolic advice, and afterwards he had, in many instances, dealt with special matters in his epistles to the churches, according as his counsel became needful; but he had never (so far as we know, or as is in itself probable) written complete epistles with regard to such external arrangements. If, however, we take a glance forward some thirty or forty years beyond his time—say to 90–100 A.D. —we can easily conceive that many things connected with his

[1] *Ante*, pp. 191 sq.

arrangements had been further developed or had degenerated, and that it was in the highest degree desirable to have permanent written instructions for the future on all those matters which he had formerly made arrangements for simply by word of mouth. The three epistles, subsequently called the Pastoral Epistles, cannot have been written before this time, as they bring before us Christian institutions which have already been very fully developed, and which have, indeed, to a considerable extent degenerated. All the other indications found in them likewise point to this period. If, now, a friend and pupil of Paul's desired at this time to transfer himself vividly into Paul's mode of thought and speech, with the view of giving his contemporaries the more emphatic instruction with regard to church institutions, the most natural thing for him to do was to make the apostle address epistles of this character—say to Timothy or Titus, as two of the best known of his assistants—in order to write, under this cover, really to all founders and heads of churches. For Timothy and Titus were then undoubtedly deceased,[1] and might already be regarded as pure models of both founders and also overseers, or pastors, of churches, as if what Paul had written to them was meant for all heads of churches. But our unknown author undoubtedly used for this purpose partly materials from epistles which Paul had at some time really written to his fellow-labourers;[2] only those epistles were as brief as was to be expected of merely business letters. As, however, our author, when it appeared to him suitable, used such materials in an imitative way, he appropriately divided amongst several epistles the sum of the extensive exhortations, which he proposed to urge upon the heads of the churches of his time as uttered directly by Paul himself. But easy as it was for him to give this form to his exhortations, it was very difficult for him to describe the numerous false teachers of his day, and particularly those above considered,[3] as having actually existed in Paul's time. He accordingly makes the great apostle speak of them prophetically just before his death only,[4] and thereby suggest to everyone who will reflect a

[1] We meet with Timothy for the last time about 66 A.D. (vol. vii. p. 471); whether he survived the great war we have no means of knowing. When later writers make him bishop of Ephesus (*Constit. Apost.* vii. 46. 1, where the source of the legend is still visible, Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 4), this is a perfectly arbitrary idea, taken simply from 1 Tim. i. 3. We know as little of Titus subsequent to the destruction of the Temple.

[2] As I have always considered; see *Jahrbb. der B. W.* ii. p. 227, and as may be seen in various details in vol. vii. *passim.*

[3] *Ante*, pp. 127 sq.

[4] 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 1; iv. 3. A parallel to this, due to a similar cause, is found in the N.T. only 2 Pet. ii. 1; iii. 3 (see *ante*, pp. 180 sq.); on the other hand, the simple words, Jude 17, 18, are by no means similar (see *ante*, p. 140).

little upon the imitative form of his language the right method of understanding its historical origin.

In this way the author, in his first and longest epistle to Timothy, at once communicates fully all the essential matters that he wishes to urge upon his contemporaries, and especially upon the heads of churches; and inasmuch as, in this epistle, both the numerous admonitions to the elders and the warnings against false teachers are supplied most completely and succinctly, it is the most admirable of the three. The author represents Paul as saying that as he had previously, in Ephesus, by word of mouth exhorted his son Timothy during his absence to oppose the false teachers in the proper way, so now, since he cannot soon come to him again, he will communicate to him in writing further instruction for that work.[1] After this introduction, or rather this literary supposition, he discusses, in the first instance in a general way, the proper public behaviour of all the members of the churches, in their religious meetings especially[2] (as if the existing churches were, after all, more essential, fundamental, and perpetual than their changing overseers). He shows him then, at greatest length, what the office and the duties of the overseer of a church (bishop) are, and what are the proper characteristics of all who otherwise take special part in the churches in promoting Christian life;[3] and he concludes with more general admonitions as to the right behaviour of the bishop both in his own personal conduct and in relation to every possible class of persons committed to his care.[4]

Though this one epistle would have sufficed, as regards the admonitions and good counsels to be given to a bishop, it is still somewhat frigid in tone; and, as if the author himself felt this, he adds a second, somewhat smaller one, addressed likewise to Timothy, which communicates all his admonitions and instructions with greater warmth, and thus forms a pleasing supplement to the first. For it is drawn up as if it had been written by Paul just before his death, and in the certain anticipation of it. Written in the frame of mind of one already belonging to a higher world, it gives the most touching exhortations, and evidently contains some words of Paul's which he actually wrote at such a solemn moment from his imprisonment. But, very properly, it does not repeat the detailed in-

[1] This is the meaning of 1 Tim. i. 3–20; the long sentence, vv. 3–17, which is at last left quite unfinished, is resumed and ended ver. 18, but what is still necessary to complete the sense is not supplied before iii. 14; iv. 13.

[2] Ch. ii.

[3] Ch. iii. 1–v. 20.

[4] v. 21–vi. 22.

structions regarding the duties of the bishop and the other principal members of the churches, and is written in one unbroken strain, without any artificial divisions. Finally, a third—still shorter—epistle, addressed to Titus (as to one who should act in another locality in essentially the same manner as Timothy) gathers together once more, in warm and touching language, all the most weighty instructions for a bishop, including the more special as well as the general duties,[1] and with reference likewise to the false teachers. It is easy to see that all three epistles, which probably existed from the first in this same combination, are from the same author, notwithstanding the slight difference in style of the second. But in point of language, way of speaking, and arrangement, the epistles differ more than the Epistle to the Ephesians from Paul's actual epistolary style, although the author writes with less independence than the author of Ephesians.[2] However, although these epistles do not rise to the full height of Paul himself, they contain, on the one hand, such an admirable reproof of the false teachers of this typical and important period in the history of the Christian Church, and, on the other, such excellent instructions regarding the offices and duties of all the chief members of a church of Christ, that they were justly very soon closely connected with the epistles of the immortal hero to whose elevation they seek to soar, and whose marvellous strength and truth they bring so near to their readers.

One particular church institution had then so greatly degenerated that it required serious reformation, particularly as at that time it occupied a solitary place in the Christian Church. We refer to the *Widows' Institute*.[3] In the Ancient Community one of the first demands of religion was to care for the widows of the Community with active sympathy;[4] and after Christ's appearance the most brotherly care for them had been combined in a new form with their own special active co-operation in sustaining the Christian Church, so that a new kind of church office was in this way early created. During

[1] We may in this way distinguish the two divisions of the epistle, Tit. i. 5–ii. 10; ii. 11–iii. 14.

[2] This tendency to look upon one or all of the apostles as delivering the laws of the Church and laying them down for all future time was gradually further developed, as is shown by the *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*, a work which has come down to us in various forms and under numerous names as *Didascalia*, *Canones*, &c., comp. *ante*, p. 13, and *infra* in connection with Clemens Romanus.

[3] The expression τὸ χηρικόν, *Const it. Apost.* iii. 1. 1; 2. 1; 8. 25; Lagarde's *Reliquiæ J. Eccl. Ant. Gr.* viii. 32, can be probably best rendered thus; comp. also Clem. *Hom.* xi. 36, *Reliquiæ J. Eccl. Syr.* (Lagarde) p. 11. 3, and the parallel expression τὸ πρεσβυτέριον, 1 Tim. iv. 14.

[4] *Ant.* p. 208.

Christ's life on earth devout widows had actively undertaken many labours of love in support of the society; and it was only a due response to this that the Apostolic Church should in return take loving care of them, especially as Christ's mother herself became one of their number. From such beginnings as these, following the practice of the parent community, the custom had now been long formed that the suitable widows of every church should receive from it regular support, and that it should be their duty to go round amongst the members of the church to collect where they could contributions for meeting the necessities of the society. And when we consider that after the stoning of Stephen every form of a community of goods ceased,[1] it becomes quite probable that then this more voluntary institution for keeping up mutual support by means of contributions of worldly wealth took its place.[2] The widows, therefore, as regularly supported by the church, and as constantly employed in its service, occupied a prominent position, and were regarded as near in rank to Christ himself,[3] as the 'altar of God;'[4] though, of course, all their duties were under higher supervision, and only widows without reproach attained to the honour. In the meetings of the Church they had probably a place of honour, and the highest vocation assigned to them (as perhaps formerly to Christ's mother) was that they made intercession for all without ceasing.[5] The peculiar bent of Christianity to care for the bruised reed, and to employ all the best energies of even those who are despised by the world in the service of God's kingdom in the earth, had in this instance found a new application; and this new creation of the Church

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 171 sq.

[2] In 1 Tim. v. 13 there is an allusion to this going round to the houses, and the practice explains the fact that the widows are called 'the altar of God' in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians iv., as like the latter they received the devout gifts. On account of the abuses of that practice, which were soon developed, the widows are admonished in the *Const. Apost.* iii. 6. 3 to remain at home and to receive there the charitable gifts, the satirical remark being made that 'the altar of God' does not 'run about.' This name 'altar of God' is repeated from Polycarp in the Ignatian Epistle to the Tars. cap. ix.; and in that to the Phil. cap. xv. the appropriate name of the institution, *τὸ τάγμα τῶν χηρῶν*, is found. As receivers of the alms of the church they are sufficiently distinguished from the deaconesses (*αἱ διάκονοι*, comp. 1 Tim. iii. 11), who had to attend especially to the sick and strangers, and might likewise be widows with children (comp. Lucianus *De Morte Peregrini*, cap. 12); indeed, they rather formed an auxiliary office to the Presbyters, and are called *πρεσβύτιδες*, *Apost. Const.* iii. 5. 3.

[3] As 1 Tim. v. 3–16, they occupy a position between the bishop and the presbyters.

[4] This expression is not found in the Pastoral Epistles, but in Polycarp, and after him in the *Const. Apost.*, as has just been observed.

[5] As is said in Polycarp, *Epist. ad Phil.* cap. iv., and still more plainly in the *Const. Apost.* iii. 5. 1, 'pray *for the givers* and for the whole church;' also iii. 14. 1.

was a high honour to Christianity on its first entrance into the wide world. But at the time under review serious abuses had grown up out of this new institution. As a matter of course, only those widows who desired it were chosen to the office; but without doubt in many churches too many pushed their way into it. Some exhibited no true Christian sense of the nature of their high office, and, while they appeared publicly proud of their distinctive honour, used it only the more freely to make their official rounds with wanton glances, and to find for themselves a new husband,[1] or to be in a position to look down in idleness upon their own more pressing domestic occupations. It had long been desirable to put an end to such abuses by means of some strict regulations, and our friend of Paul seeks quite in the great apostle's spirit most earnestly to secure the retention of the original Christian discipline and order in this institution, and the prevention of its interference in any way with the duties of Christian domestic life. The departed apostle therefore commands (1) that no widow who is already usefully and necessarily occupied sufficiently with her own children or grandchildren shall be chosen to this office; and (2) further, when that condition is met, that no widow under sixty years of age, and none who has not long approved herself as a zealous Christian, and none who has been married to more than one husband, shall be entrusted with it.[2] And these counsels soon met with general compliance,[3] as, indeed, the number of widows required for such official duties need not have been very large. It was besides evidently one of the chief objects of the Pastoral Epistles

[1] This is the sense of the words 1 Tim. v. 11, 'when they are prŏud of Christ (*καταστρηνιάσουσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ*), that is, when they are in the sacred office, and on that very account become the more arrogant, 'they determine to marry.' On their reception it was understood that they would not marry again (hence *τὴν πρώτην πίστιν ἠθέτησαν*, ver. 12); and it was always regarded as improper that those who had as widows devoted themselves wholly to the service of the Lord and his Church should seek again to enter the common rank of life. For this reason the widows are spoken of as *virgins who are called widows* in the ingenious language of Ignatius, *Epist. ad Smyrn.* cap. xiii.; on the other hand, the second augmentor in the *Epist. ad Antioch.* cap. xi. can do nothing more than repeat everything verbatim.

[2] This is the sense of the passage 1 Tim. v. 3–16. But in such passages as Acts vi. 1; ix. 39, 41, Ignat. *Epist. ad Polyc.* cap. iv. all poor widows are meant.

[3] As we perceive from the *Const. Apost.* iii. 1–14: where every essential point is regulated simply in accordance with the first pastoral epistle; the regulations are briefer and also freer in the *Reliquiæ J. Eccl. Ant. Gr.* (ed. Lagarde) p. 8. 14. It appears from all that we have seen that this widows' institute was the exact opposite of the subsequent institution of nuns; and though the vow of such *virgins* came gradually to be allowed, it was, as is still said in the *Const. Apost.* iv. 14, *Reliquiæ J. Ecc. Ant.* p. 8. 24, *without command of the Lord.* Comp. Athenagoras' *Embassy* xxviii. 7, 8; in the case of the Apostles Peter and Philip, Clem. *Strom.* iii. 6. 52, and Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 30, purposely mention that they *ἐπαιδοποιήσαντο.*

to bring this entire institution under proper regulations, although from the plan of the epistles it was only in the first of the three that it was dealt with.

In other respects that change in the internal organisation and government of the churches which we have previously seen could not fail to come [1] had now fully taken place. From the midst of the presbyters, or bishops, one had been gradually more and more definitely separated as the true head and governor of the church, and he was now usually called absolutely the *Bishop*, whilst the name of Presbyter, or Elder, was reserved for the others. The presbyters, it is true, could never be absent, and for those of them, at all events, who served also as teachers in the church a suitable *honorarium* is demanded; [2] but the chief care of the church rests upon the bishop alone—in true teaching, and the keeping out of all false doctrine, in the wise supervision of the deacons, deaconesses, and official widows,[3] who are not to be appointed without trial, in the direction of all the various members of the society, and especially in the conduct of his own life as the necessary pattern for the church.[4] As the bishop, especially in troubled times, had an enormous amount of work to do, it is expressly said that a young man, if he were in other respects competent, might very properly undertake the difficult office; [5] an arrangement by which the bishop is completely removed from the ranks of the mere elders. In other respects our genuine disciple of Paul is still absolutely removed from all the hypocrisy which subsequently appeared in connection with this office, and which as favoured by the Pope laid waste the entire Church; it is in these epistles supposed, as a matter of course, that the bishops, elders, and deacons will marry, and all that is required is that they adhere strictly to monogamy; [6] with which nothing is demanded that was not soon (after a remnant of earlier error in this respect had been

[1] Vol. vii. p. 171.

[2] 1 Tim. v. 17, 18.

[3] That the bishop had the greatest influence in the selection of these widows follows as a matter of course; but it is nowhere indicated, and cannot be inferred from Tit. i. 5, that he chose the deacons and deaconesses, 1 Tim. iii. 8–13, still less the presbyters, v. 17–20.

[4] Eutychius, *Ann.* i. pp. 330 sq. (ed. Pococke), states that until the time of Constantine, the bishop of Alexandria was always chosen by the twelve elders of the (general) church there from their own midst, and that they had then adopted as elder in his place another member of the church. Whatever may have been the form of this *cooptatio*, there is undoubtedly in this statement the traces of an early and trustworthy reminiscence. I have shown in my *Johanneische Schriften* ii. pp. 125 sq. that the Apocalypse presupposes the existence of bishops.

[5] 1 Tim. iv. 12; but the no less important instruction that he must not be a 'novice' or without the needful knowledge and skill for the office, iii. 6, must be taken in conjunction with the former passage.

[6] 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6–9.

given up) regarded by all Christians, without exception, as necessary.

But, if possible, still more noble, and a more immediate outcome of the genuine Christian spirit, are the exhortations in these three epistles to a true Christian life, such as every Christian ought to exhibit in his position, and especially in his domestic relations.[1] And we have already seen[2] that such admonitions were really not unnecessary in those days, and did not fall by any means upon unfruitful soil.

The Permanence of the Offices of the Church.—The Epistles of Clement and Polycarp.

But while, on the one hand, epistles were written as from an apostle, on the other there is no doubt that a far larger number of a purely official character passed between church and church, or between prominent teachers and churches, this having become the growing practice of primitive Christian times. Of this class an epistle has been preserved almost entire[3] from the Roman to the Corinthian church. The author's name is not given; and it was not necessary, as the epistle was published in the name of a church. But, according to common early tradition, it was always ascribed to an author bearing the simple name of *Clement*,[4] whilst we have no ground for doubting that it was written by a distinguished member of the church of Rome. This epistle is very important, both as the solitary fairly well preserved specimen of a letter from one church to another from this early time, and also on account of its subject-matter and its author, of whom we shall speak below. We are justified in supposing that it was written about 90–100 A.D.,[5]

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 1 sq.; Tit. ii. 1–iii. 11.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 102 sq.

[3] [In 1868 the only MS. of this first epistle of Clement of Rome was that of the Codex Alexandrinus. This is defective, particularly towards the end. In 1875 Bryennius published a new and complete text based on the valuable MSS. which he discovered in Constantinople. This *Codex Constantinopolitanus* supplies the lost leaf towards the end of the first epistle (as well as the complete text of the second epistle, to be mentioned below), as well as readings for the numerous shorter *lacunæ* which are so frequent throughout the first epistle. Of course this important codex is now used by all the new editors of Clement—Gebhardt and Harnack, Hilgenfeld (1876), Lightfoot (1877).]

[4] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 3. 3, simply following ancient tradition, speaks of Clement as the author of this epistle, the contents of which he clearly gives. Clement of Alexandria and Origen often quote it under his name; and according to Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 16. 38, no one doubted its origin from Clement. We see also from Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 16 that Hegesippus had referred to these disturbances in Corinth. We shall see below that the three Pastoral Epistles are later; and the unusual expression μωμοσκοπεῖν in Polycarp's *Epist. ad Phil.* cap. iv., with many other phrases and ideas, is taken from our epistle.

[5] We cannot suppose an earlier date, for the reason that the Corinthian church could not then be spoken of as *old*, cap. xlvii.

when the church at Rome had, during Domitian's reign, been suddenly thown into confusion by many successive and unexpected afflictions of a serious nature; but the flourishing Corinthian church had been previously agitated by internal commotions, the report of which had made everywhere a bad impression, and had reached as far as Rome. The majority of the Corinthian church had taken offence at some regulation of its presbyters, imagined that injustice had been done by them to one or another Christian,[1] and rose up in rebellion against all the presbyters.[2] The immediate cause of these disorders arose apparently, like earlier ones in Paul's day, from a more strict regulation as to the distribution of the sacred supper which the presbyters sought to introduce, and by which some members of the church felt themselves aggrieved.[3] But the presbyters had considered their deposition from office unjust, and thus an obstinate contention had arisen which threatened to upset the church. As soon, therefore, as the church of Rome, whose voice on these scandalous contentions was necessarily of greatest weight, had recovered a little from its own troubles of an entirely different nature, it issued this official opinion, which sternly disapproved of the conduct of the offending members of the church, and reminded them of their duty. It is easy to observe, moreover, that it is a convert from Heathenism who is speaking in the name of the entire Roman church; that he is a man who has, with great zeal and genuine love, steeped his mind in the mysteries of the Christian faith and in the study of the sacred Scriptures; and now, having thus thoroughly qualified himself, gives his judgment upon the questions before him. The passages of the Old Testament, which seem to him suitable for the purpose of his book, are to him so fresh and of such supreme importance that he often cites them at full length; whilst, on the other hand, he is very familiar with illustrations from the Heathen world,[4] and, above all, he shows himself to be a Roman by birth.[5] The character of the epistle is extremely

[1] Cap. xlvii.

[2] [Comp. lix. *ad fin.*]

[3] This can be gathered from capp. xl. xli. compared with the general scope of the epistle and the arrangement of its subject-matter; and therefore at the very beginning, cap. ii., there is pointed allusion to the previous good arrangement of the ἐφόδια Θεοῦ [C. reads Χριστοῦ], i.e. the Lord's Supper.

[4] E.g. that of the Danaides and Dircæ, cap. vi., that of the Phœnix, cap. xxv. (for the author does not refer to the passage, Job xxix. 18), and many others less fully carried out, as cap. lv.

[5] The phrase '*our* generals' under whom the soldiers serve with so much order and obedience [*Cod. Con.* ἐκτικῶς] cap. xxxvii. betrays the Roman by birth; the expression '*amongst us*' cap. lv. points to the sufferings of the Roman Christians in particular [comp. on both points now capp. lix. lx. lxi.]

simple as respects its plan and arrangement, and also its meaning and purpose. Its expositions are often elaborate and strongly didactic; and, with all the rigour of its judgment on the serious offences which had been committed, it still, with genuine Christian gentleness and love, offers counsel for the good of the church.[1]

When we come to examine the matter itself with which this long epistle is concerned, its great importance appears at once. The question of the permanence, or the contrary, of office in the Christian Church at that time concerned directly presbyters only;[2] but it was they who had been from the commencement of the Apostolic Church the real directors of the churches and occupants of the most important office.[3] Moreover from the very first the true overseer or bishop of the church was taken from the number of the presbyters alone, and his office had its roots in theirs.[4] But the form which his office might take in the various churches, whilst everything of this kind had yet to be more fully developed, might be very dissimilar, since in some the bishop would take a more independent and permanent pre-eminence amongst the presbyters than in others. In the Corinthian church his position had evidently as yet not been definitely fixed, so that, on that account, he shared simply the fortunes of the rest of the presbyters, for he is never specially spoken of anywhere in the long epistle. But, as he was thus easily counted amongst the other presbyters, the want of permanency in the highest office became the more dangerous; the arbitrary and unbridled action on the part of the multitude might the more irresistibly undermine the entire existence of a church; and in Corinth, particularly, good order and discipline had then for some time wholly disappeared.

[1] On that account it is folly itself to doubt the origin of this epistle from Clement, and to bring it down to later times. Neither is its language Hellenistic: the construction *οὗ πνοὴ αὐτοῦ, whose breath*, cap. xxi., is Hebraistic undoubtedly; but the sentence is taken from an Apocryphon, Clement often interweaving sacred citations with his own discourse, cap. xxiv.

[2] See capp. i. iii. xliv. xlvi. xlvii. lvii. The expression *πρεσβύτεροι* is varied cap. i. by the more general one *προηγούμενοι* or *ἡγούμενοι, leaders*, but merely for the sake of the greater generality and redundance of style; to this must be added that Clement has generally a liking for this Roman expression, capp. v. xxi. xxxvii. lv.; the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also prefers this more Roman term, xiii. 7, 17, 24, and as this epistle was intended for Italy (vol. vii. p. 476) it is very remarkable that Clement very frequently makes use of it. It is true that under this more general name the deacons e.g. might be likewise intended; but it appears from the whole subject-matter of the epistle that the question was then about the presbyters only as the most important officers.

[3] Vol. vii. pp. 141 sq., 166 sq.

[4] It appears from Phil. i. 1, Acts xx. 17, 18, 28, and our Clement capp. xlii. xliv. that the name *ἐπίσκοποι* varied originally with the more Hebrew term *πρεσβύτεροι* as its equivalent; from this fact alone it follows that the bishop was taken from their number.

The right view of this question could not long be doubtful to a calmly reflecting Christian mind. An office which can be taken away again by caprice or passion, whether these unworthy motives proceed from the masses or the heads of a society, is not an office at all; and in a Christian church it may and ought to remain the more permanently with him to whom it is entrusted, as the truths and the powers of which he is the organ are peculiarly unchangeable, and as it is precisely the purpose of his office to let them operate unrestrainedly and effectively in accordance with their own nature; and, lastly, fitting stewards of those truths and powers are hard to find. Nor may the permanency of the office be partial, or liable to be limited to arbitrarily fixed periods, since in that case also caprice on the part of the bestowers, and unworthy fear on the part of the officer, would prevail. The more necessary, however, it is that the office should be lifelong, the more care must be taken to secure the worthiness and proved efficiency of the person to be appointed. But our Clement does not thus look into the intrinsic reasons of the matter, as Paul, after his manner, would have at all events briefly examined and indicated them; for the book of Clement, generally, does not attempt to reach either the height or the profundity of an apostolic work, but proves all its points with simple arguments from ordinary life. The arguments, therefore, which it adduces in support of the permanency of ecclesiastical offices are essentially two, which are taken from the two general and established spheres of Christian faith and life.

In the first place he appeals to the arrangement which had been made by the apostles themselves, as this argument was necessarily the most natural and weighty from the peculiar nature of the offices. He reminds[1] the Corinthians that the apostles, as they themselves knew, wherever they went preaching the Gospel, first themselves appointed presbyters and deacons in those countries and towns, and then afterwards gave the further decree[2] that, when those whom they had appointed died, other approved men should take their office. It followed as a matter of course that those who took the place of the officers first appointed were to have the same authority; but after most of those had died whom Paul had appointed, the Corinthians seem to have regarded those put in their places as less

[1] Cap. xlii. xliv.

[2] ἐπινομή, cap. xliv., is like ἐπινομίς, an *added law*, or a later addition to a law; but in an early Latin translation (Pitra's *Spicil. Solesm.* i. p. 293) it is taken as meaning merely *forma*. [The *Codex Constant.* reads ἐπιδομὴν, and later editors suggest very various conjectural emendations.]

honourable than their predecessors, and to have then the more easily refused to obey any of them. It is true we do not now know when Paul delivered any such direction as that a church might by its own choice fill up vacancies caused by the death of a presbyter whom he had appointed; he probably gave it to various churches when the first vacancy occurred; and the step was almost a matter of course, only that in those times the word of an apostle was of such authority that on all important questions of the day a definite apostolic declaration was very gladly appealed to. In like manner the apostles collectively were no less eagerly referred to, especially on matters like this, as to which, beyond doubt, none of them would have given another judgment; but as Clement expressly states that there were then presbyters still in Corinth or elsewhere, appointed *by the apostles*, other apostles in addition to Paul must have stayed in many countries as they passed through and taken part in the consecration of presbyters; and from this fact it follows also that our epistle was not a very late one. And when Clement adds that the apostles had made all their arrangements with perfect foresight, he simply expresses thereby the general view of his time. But this is all he has to say on the matter; and it is noteworthy that he makes no reference to the three Pastoral Epistles.[1] We see, however, from express remarks of Clement that he regarded Peter and Paul as the chief apostles,[2] and he follows Paul's lines of thought and modes of expression most readily.

But as Clement everywhere seeks to prove Christian truth by references to the books of the Old Testament, in the matter before us he shows beforehand that in the Old Testament also everything connected with worship was carefully arranged in all respects and determined strictly according to order and legal principles.[3] In this passage he quotes as an illustration that to the high priest his own special functions were assigned,

[1] Although e.g. the principle of 1 Tim. v. 19 would be quite in point. We might rather suppose that some of the phrases of our epistle, which was early widely circulated, were in the mind of the author of the Pastoral Epistles, as *ἕτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν*, cap. ii., comp. Tit. iii. 1; i. 16; *λῦδς περιούσιος*, cap. lviii. [lxiv. in *Codex C.*], comp. Tit. ii. 14 (where the thought is less simple); *προσδεκτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ (Θεοῦ)*, cap. vii., comp. 1 Tim. ii. 3; v. 4 (not met with elsewhere in the epistles of Paul, though *εὐπροσδεκτός* is often); *τὴν ἀγαπὴν αὐτῶν μὴ κατὰ προσκλίσεις*, capp. li. xlvii., comp. 1 Tim. v. 21; *ἀγαθὴ* or *καθαρὰ συνείδησις*, capp. xli. xlv., comp. 1 Tim. i. 5, 19, and quite similarly iii. 9; 2 Tim i. 3. Likewise *σεμνός*, which is so frequent in Clement and the Pastoral Epistles, is found in Paul in Phil. iv. 8 only, and many similar phenomena might be produced.

[2] Vol. vii. p. 469.

[3] Capp. xl. xli.; the important passage regarding the three orders of priests in the Old Testament, cap. xl.; but previously, cap. xxxii., there was a more incidental reference to the model of the order of priests and Levites in the Old Testament.

to the priests their own peculiar place appointed, to the Levites their own ministries entrusted, and the laity were bound to their own laic precepts. And it is this very passage which in later times was taken to mean that Clement had therein sought to describe and establish from the Old Testament the whole hierarchic order of bishop (Pope), presbyters, deacons, and laity, as it was gradually developed in the Papal middle ages, as originally an Apostolic institution. Nor is it possible to avoid seeing that the simple constitution of the early parent church has now long given way to a somewhat altered form, but mainly in two directions only.

In the first place the deacons, to whom in the primitive form of the Christian Church a very busy but limited sphere of labour was assigned,[1] received gradually, after the dissolution of that primitive form,[2] a considerably altered position. They had still to look after the finances and the poor, as far as these duties continued to be of importance after the cessation of the community of goods and the creation of the institute of widows,[3] but they had also become assistants of the presbyters in their labours as ministers of worship and as teachers, and were on that account gradually classed more and more closely with the presbyters, although always occupying a lower degree than they.[4] Secondly, many things were newly developed as regards the manner of appointment to offices. When an apostle or apostolic man founded a church he also appointed elders and deacons, choosing undoubtedly those best fitted according to his own judgment and that of the church; but as in everything else that he did, so in this also he proceeded especially in accordance with his own creative authority, receiving the confidence of the church in his action. In the case of new elections which gradually became necessary in such established churches a new mode of action was required. And though deacons might continue to be appointed on the nomination of the presbyters by the immediate election of the church and the confirmation of the presbyters,[5] no one, very properly, ventured to appoint the presbyters by simple popular election, because the laity alone in any particular church could not really consider

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 144 sq.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 166 sq.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 201 sq.

[4] 1 Tim. iii. 8–13. They accordingly appear immediately after the bishop and as closely connected with him; but, Phil. i. 1, they also appear with the bishops or presbyters as forming together the heads of a church.

[5] It might appear from such passages as *Const. Apost.* iii. 15. 5 as if the bishop alone chose the deacons; but from passages like *Const. Apost.* vii. 31. 1 we see that this is only in appearance, and that the people everywhere took part in all elections. [Comp. now, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, cap. xv.]

themselves as possessing either the capacity or authority for such a step. For as the churches had in each case always been founded by an apostle and the higher Christian spirit operating in him, and as its presbyters had been appointed by him, it was distinctly felt that no church might ever withdraw itself from that higher spirit which presided over all churches; and thus they only were regarded as true presbyters who had been consecrated by a man like the apostles by the laying on of his hands, and who had been chosen by the consenting people.[1] During the second and third generations of Christians there were undoubtedly still men who, honoured as the nearest friends or disciples of the apostles, travelled from church to church in order, amongst other things, to consecrate the new presbyters that might be required; whilst from the ranks of the presbyters (as we saw above) the more or less influential bishop was taken. As by this means the germ of a threefold order in the body of the officers of the general church of Christ was actually supplied,[2] by degrees the three orders of priests of the Old Testament, just referred to, might be compared to them, or might be taken as their legal model, with the view of forbidding all popular influence upon them (since the priests of the Old Testament in all their three grades were a perfectly independent body, and not at all subject to popular election), and of creating in the midst of the Christian Church a priesthood complete in itself, and in no way dependent on the choice of the people. But in Clement there is not the slightest trace of this degeneracy, which gradually became so injurious in later times. When he refers to the Old Testament for instances, it is only by way of illustration, with the view of proving that in everything, and accordingly in the arrangement of church offices, a proper order must be observed; and although his examples from the Old Testament are always the highest in his estimation, in this case he refers also with great emphasis to Heathen models.[3] For this purpose he nowhere employs allegory,[4] and does not in detail give a Christian meaning to the

[1] This follows beyond doubt from the important passage, cap. xliv., 'the presbyters who were appointed by the apostles, *or afterwards by other men of repute*, with the consent of the whole church;' and such passages as 1 Tim. v. 22, Tit. i. 5 sq. allude to the same rule.

[2] A threefold order which, as the disciples of the apostles gradually disappeared, and everything took a more regular form, was more definitely developed in such a way that either the individual bishops formed together the highest rank, or that an archbishop or pope assumed a rank above them.

[3] Previously in cap. xxxvii.

[4] Clement also refers emphatically to the Christian *Gnosis*, particularly with regard to the examples of the Old Testament capp. i. xxxvi. xl. xli., comp. xlviii.; but he does not go beyond general lessons and admonitions to be drawn from them; he does not by the allegorical method convert Old Testament particulars into so

three grades of priests in the Old Testament. On the contrary, his language indicates most plainly that the people had in his time always a great share in the choice of all officers, and the entire period of the second and third generations of Christians knew nothing whatever of a degeneration of pure Christianity such as of necessity finally led logically to the horrible abominations of the stagnation of the Greek and the hypocrisy of the Papal church.

If offices of the churches had not been at that time still subject to the strong influence of a popular election, such disturbances as those at Corinth would never have arisen. And as it seemed to our Clement, or rather to the Roman church whose views he represents, in the highest degree necessary to check such disturbances, and to obtain the acknowledgment of the proper principle, he collects in his elaborate and earnest epistle not merely the above obvious arguments, but all conceivable ones, in order to bring the seriously distracted church to retrace its steps and take a sober view of matters. And as an exhaustive, calm, and emphatic discussion of the point, and a final rebuke of the wrong action of the church, it supplies an excellent model. When Clement, therefore, has in his introduction briefly stated the case which was then everywhere well known, touched upon the admirable condition of the Corinthian church before the outbreak of this contention, and intimated that nothing but arrogance arising from such advantages could have misled them into commencing such differences,[1] he points out to them (1) the infinite misery which has always been caused in the world by envy and contentiousness,[2] and in contrast with these lamentable instances from history, which had so painfully affected Christians themselves, he at once presents cheering examples of the greatest benignity, love, and submissive patience which sacred history supplies in such large numbers, with the view of therewith beginning his general exhortation to Christian repentance and conversion.[3] But to

many Christian instances, and does not remotely allude to three degrees of a Christian priesthood as corresponding to the three degrees of the Old Testament priesthood. On the contrary, according to cap. xli. *ad fin.* it is only the punishment of death affixed in the Old Testament to the violation of the sacerdotal regulation in which he (of course not in a literal sense) recognises something which has a very appropriate exemplary significance in the Christian Church generally. It thus becomes significant that, following the Epistle to the Hebrews, he everywhere regards Christ himself as the High Priest of Christians, and, cap. xxxii., distinguishes between priests and Levites only of the Old Testament, the general relation of whom to Christian presbyters and deacons is more natural.

[1] i–iii *ad init.*

[2] iii–vi.

[3] The transition to admonition begins first vii–ix. *in med.*; the contrary examples follow ix. *in med.*–xix. *ad init.*

prepare still more fully and emphatically for this exhortation, as the conclusion of the entire epistle, he once more resorts (2) to still more general truths, points the offenders to the infinite goodness, wisdom, and righteousness of God himself, as to so many spurs which must urge to all virtue,[1] refers to the certainty of immortality and the judgment,[2] and finally, still more emphatically if possible, to the requirement of perfect Christian righteousness and holiness of life.[3] He can thus (3), in the last place, exhort with the greater earnestness not only to the general duty of Christian order and subordination, but also specially to compliance, modesty, placability, and submission in the particular serious case about which he is writing,[4] discuss this case itself, as far as this had become necessary on account of its sad notoriety,[5] and go on at the end to urge in every possible way the offended and distracted minds in the church to give themselves to the work of Christian love and peace.[6] In each of its chief sections the epistle starts with a reference to the example of Christ, and if the discourse with its cordial admonitions and its endeavour to say everything in any way bearing upon the matter in question returns to the same point, we are bound to recognise that everything flows from a rich spring of purest Christian love and earnest interest in the common Christian cause.

According to the custom of the time in a matter of such moment the epistle was conveyed by a special deputation of three members of the Roman church to Corinth,[7] and undoubtedly soon produced a good effect. And its main purpose —the defence of the permanency of the offices of the churches— was secured for a wider circle than this more immediate one, and the truth which the epistle contended for has since worked to the advantage of the whole Christian Church. The epistle, therefore, was soon very generally circulated; and although in itself a very simple one, and not at all to be compared with those of Paul in those early times, yet as it first dealt with a matter of such importance for all the churches, and on that was regarded as decisive, it was almost universally appended to the Apostolic

[1] xx–xxiii.
[2] xxiii–xxviii.
[3] xxix–xxxvi.
[4] xxxvii–xxxix.
[5] xl–l.
[6] li–lvii. The whole epistle therefore does not lack a good arrangement of its extensive and varied matter. [The new portion of the epistle supplied in the Constantinopolitan MS. (capp. lvii. *ad fin.*–lxiii.) is composed chiefly of a long prayer, which has no very close connection with the immediate object of the epistle, but its official and authoritative character is brought out more prominently in the new passages, lix. lxiii.]
[7] lxiii. [In the new MS. these men are further described as πιστοὶ καὶ σώφρονες, ἀπὸ νεότητος ἀναστραφέντες ἕως γήρους ἀμέμπτως ἐν ἡμῖν.]

writings themselves, and publicly read in the churches.[1] Undoubtedly the reputation of its author contributed largely to that of his epistle, as we shall soon see.

The permanency of the episcopal and other offices when once established by law had undoubtedly its dangers, and it follows as a matter of course that there must be some means of punishing the more rigorously an officer who may use his permanent position for selfish ends. In this respect again it was an advantage when there was a power superior to the individual churches which could equitably decide with regard to the just complaints of the churches; and as a presbyter, or perhaps a bishop, was regarded as fully authorised only when he had been consecrated by a man of apostolic authority, so in the same way he only was considered to be justly removed by his church who had been censured by one of that authority, who was thus equal or rather superior to him in general estimation. We have on this point plain evidence in the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, which had been occasioned by such a case.[2] In the church at Philippi, which had been founded by Paul, and had always remained peculiarly dear to him, and which after he was gone distinguished itself all along by its Christian faith and zeal, a presbyter Valens, with his wife, had made himself very much disliked by his covetousness, and probably, also, by misapplication of the moneys of the church, and was on that account complained of by the church.[3] The church kept up a close intercourse with Polycarp, the Bishop of Smyrna, as one of the most esteemed disciples of John, and shortly before had actively assisted captive Christians whom he had commended to it on their passage through Macedonia.[4] It had now applied to Polycarp for his judgment in the above matter of the elder

[1] See *ante*, p. 205. The Corinthian bishop Dionysius asserts about 170 A.D. that the Epistle of Clement was still read in his church (Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 23. 11). On that account only has it been preserved in the *Codex Alexandrinus* as an ancient biblical book attached to the rest of the Scriptures. Unfortunately there is a considerable gap in this MS. before the closing greeting, cap. lviii. [see now *ante* p. 205]. The text of this MS. has been edited and published in Tischendorf's *Appendix Codicum Celeberrimorum*, Lips. 1867.

[2] Polycarp, of whom Irenæus, his disciple, gives us information, fell as a martyr between 161–169 A.D. according to Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 15; according to *Chron. Pasch.* i. 480 sq. 163 A.D., but according to all accounts he was then very old. Hence he may in his youth, like Papias (*ante*, p. 156), have known the Apostle John, as Irenæus iii. 3. 4, and *Epist. ad Florin.* apud Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* v. 20, states.

[3] Polyc. *Ep. ad Phil.* capp. xi. and xii.: a number of such cases are presupposed as possible in *Hermæ Past.* iii. 9. 26.

[4] Who these captives were, is not indicated cap. i.; as, however, Ignatius according to capp. ix. xiii. was personally known to the Philippians, and had already met with his end in Rome, according to cap. ix., and as his journey from Antioch to Rome was overland by way of Smyrna, Troas, Neapolis, and Philippi (Ign. *Ad Smyrn.* cap. xii. and *Mart. Ign.* cap. v.), it is probable that Ignatius and some of his companions are here intended.

Valens; and his epistle, which has come down to us,[1] is really only the judgment which he felt compelled to send to them. He can only disapprove of the conduct of the presbyter, but does not go into the details of the case, which had no doubt been communicated to him, and therefore writes no very long epistle. But as no epistle to a church from such a man could in those days very well omit Christian admonitions and outpourings of heart, after the introduction of the epistle[2] he speaks first in a general way of the vice of covetousness and of the duties of all those entrusted with offices in the churches,[3] gives especially, in connection with other more general admonitions, a warning with regard to the Gnostic false teachers of the time[4] (a warning which an epistle of that kind by one not a Gnostic could hardly omit), and then first approaches the lamentable case of the presbyter Valens, whose offence he advises the church to judge as mildly as possible,[5] then coming to a close with a few remarks concerning common friends.[6] The whole epistle, with its pervading simplicity, makes no high pretensions; according to all indications it was written before 120 A.D.,[7] and is very important, also, on account of this its comparatively early date.

3. *The Episcopal Office.—The Martyrdom and the Epistles of Ignatius.*

But at length nothing became so important in the consolidation of the constitution of the churches as the more complete organisation of the episcopal office, in other words, the representation of the unity and authority of a church in one person. As we have seen, the bishop was taken from the ranks of the presbyters, but gradually became also their superior,[8]

[1] It is quoted in Irenæus *Adv. Hær.* iii. 3. 4 *ad fin.*, and it is the greatest injustice that its origin from Polycarp has been doubted, or in fact denied, in our days.

[2] Capp. i–iii.

[3] iv–vi.: as yet no bishop is specially distinguished from the presbyters, which was the case also in the Corinthian church, *ante*, p. 207.

[4] vii–x.

[5] xi–xii.

[6] xiii–xiv.

[7] Ignatius had fallen a martyr, cap. ix., but it cannot have been long before, cap. xiii.: according to this passage, which occurs in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 36. 14, 15, also, he had probably written to Polycarp from Philippi, requesting him to bring about a closer intercourse between the Philippian and the Antiochian churches. According to the end of cap. xiii., which is found in the Latin translation of the fifteenth century only, Ignatius would have then been living; but this, like other mistakes in the epistle, must be ascribed to the stupidity of the translator. It would, however, be quite wrong to suppose that this passage cap. xiii. refers to the Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp capp. vii–viii. in its first recension, or that it was taken from it; the passage is in its matter even quite foreign to that in the Ignatian epistle.

[8] As may be implied in the instructions 1 Tim. v. 19, 20, although Timothy,

and thus represented most fully, as the permanency of office in his case necessarily assumed the greatest importance, not only the unity, but also the stability of the direction of the churches. The straits and pressure of the time in which the Christian Church still found itself, and which had, indeed, gradually become more trying in the course of these decades, contributed powerfully to the formation of the strictest unity; one man was obliged and necessitated more and more to act for all amidst the innumerable troubles and trials of each church; and though there might be no want of presbyters, the office of a bishop was early conferred only after hesitation, and was sought by but few.[1] The office arose without any thought of a previous model such as Peter, or still less such as Christ might have supplied; the bitter necessities of the time themselves led to the complete formation of the office; so that such churches as those at Corinth and Philippi, in which the bishop was for some time lost, as it were, in the ranks of the presbyters, soon ceased to exist. But as in such cases of the gradual rise of a new art or a new office one man above all often by his illustrious example creates a great precedent, so was it also in this instance; and Ignatius, the Bishop of Antioch, was called to create this momentous precedent, and he in the end became so very famous through the epistles bearing his name.

Of his life we know but little, or rather nothing, before its illustrious end; but then it appears in splendour. His name is another form of the ancient Roman Egnatius, and to judge from it he may have been by birth a Heathen; but of his antecedents we know nothing further. According to ancient tradition he was the second bishop of the extremely important church at Antioch, in Syria;[2] and undoubtedly he must have become a Christian comparatively early in life, and as such have distinguished himself greatly by his enthusiastic faithfulness.[3] The surname Theophorus (one who bears God in his heart) he probably received, as having been previously a Heathen, at his baptism, when he had at some time nobly shown in a memorable way his love to God, and from that time forth he rejoiced to bear it;[4] in later times he received yet higher

as he is described in the Pastoral Epistles, does not appear as a simple bishop, but much more as one with power to appoint bishops.

[1] Hence the remark, 1 Tim. iii. 1, at the opening of the description of a true bishop.

[2] Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 22. 36, Ign. *Ep. ad Antioch.* cap. vii.; but it is a later invention in this case, as in that of Rome, that Peter was bishop here before Euodius.

[3] The later myths that he was the child intended, Matt. xviii. 3, 4, and that he desired to see the mother of Christ then living with John (see the three Latin epistles in Dressel's *Patres Apost.* 2nd ed. pp. 348 sq.) have in so far an excuse.

[4] As the three Syriac epistles are genuine there is no reason for casting

surnames.[1] But we should scarcely have known either of him or his predecessor Euodius so much as the name if he had not in death presented the first great example of the way in which, to the highest admiration of the world, a presbyter and bishop, though of Heathen descent, could maintain immovably his Christian faithfulness unto death in the midst of the utmost tortures. Outside the Holy Land it was undoubtedly nowhere so difficult as in Antioch to conduct a Christian church through all the storms of the time; in this third city of the Roman empire, where Christianity had early collected a large church, the Judeans had regained their ancient proud privileges,[2] and Syro-Roman Heathenism was very powerful. Amidst the continual severe conflicts of this church the bishop, as its most indefatigable leader in the struggle, might obtain the greatest respect, and this was accorded to Ignatius. But, as his three genuine epistles [3] that have come down to us show, he was also of an extremely brave and undaunted spirit, a man who might be compared with a Stephen or a Paul, only that, as a Heathen by birth,[4] he gave in this prominent official position for the first time the sign of the most burning love and the purest zeal for Christ's cause. These three epistles, which supply us with the most reliable evidence with regard to him, were written but a short time before his death, and in a specially elevated state of mind; but his soul must have previously been always in mood of kindred elevation. We no longer know [5] what was the immediate occasion of his being sentenced at last to death by the

suspicion on the name; it is found elsewhere also, comp. Land's *Anecdota Syriaca*, i. p. 120.

[1] The surname النوراني in Barhabræus's *Arabic Chronicle*, p. 119, is at first sight strange, and is not found in his earlier Syriac Chronicle; but it is probably taken from a Syriac ܣܪܦܝܐ, and signifies the *Seraphic*; for the word denotes some such class of angels, Knös, *Chrest.* p. 90.

[2] Vol. vii. p. 611.

[3] They have in recent times been recovered in a very old Syriac translation, which was published by W. Cureton (1845). The question may be raised whether these three epistles have not been in places very much abbreviated: the abbreviation of early books was a very common practice; and as we see from the Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans, cap. iv., and of Polycarp to the Philippians, cap. i., that Ignatius wrote more than these three, now preserved without later additions, further examination of these three may prove that none of them has come down to us quite entire. Comp. further on this point *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1862, pp. 714–20. Land in his *Anecdota Syriaca* ii. pp. 7 sq. gives some passages of Ignatius; one is probably from Eph. cap. iii., another certainly from Magn. cap. vii.; further comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1868, pp. 1470 sq.

[4] For we find in him not a single sign of Judean origin; and his Roman name and the remarkably large number of Latin words which he uses point probably to the western countries as his home.

[5] The three *Martyrologies* of Ignatius, Dressel's *Patres Apost.* pp. 208 sq., 350 sq., 368 sq., successively outstrip each other in legendary character; and though they all agree in stating that Ignatius fell as a martyr in Rome in the reign of Trajan, which Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 36, confirms, they do not enable us to gather the year of his death.

Roman governor of Antioch; the only thing certain is that this took place in the reign of Trajan, and that a case of this kind had probably never occurred before. For he was sentenced like a malefactor to fight with wild animals in Rome, and was taken to the capital with other Christian captives under the guard of ten soldiers.[1] The aged and universally venerated Bishop of the church of Antioch, which was itself so distinguished above many others, was led in chains by the long overland route to Rome, and was everywhere eagerly visited and accompanied with intense sympathy by the Christian churches into the neighbourhood of which he came; but his soul remained immovable all through the long and severe journey; and, glad to fall as a sacrifice for Christ's cause, he advanced towards the distant place of his horrible death more like an already emancipated spirit than a bound and troubled man.

The martyr's joy in view of death, and the desire to become in suffering and dying for Christ's cause like Christ himself, and by such sublime obedience to the Divine will to become, as it were, a glorified disciple of God,[2] had then long been growing in strength;[3] but never before this case of Ignatius had it appeared in view of the most terrible death with such power and such certainty of eternal victory in one who had been a Heathen, and such a venerated head of a Christian church, before the eyes and amid the warmest sympathy of all the Christian churches of Asia, Greece, and Italy. Moreover, there was a further circumstance which deserves our full attention. Nothing is so remarkable in these epistles of Ignatius as that they omit altogether the exhortation to obey the existing governments which is customary in similar books.[4] This cannot be an accident; and when we remember that the sentence of the Roman governor upon Ignatius was a most unusual one, we have no reason to doubt that Ignatius rejected the Roman rule itself as a Heathen one, and that this was the ultimate ground of his violent conflict. It was he who first had the courage to declare plainly that all existing Heathen supremacy

[1] According to Polycarp, *Ep. ad Phil.* cap. i. (comp. *ante*, p. 214), comp. Ign. *Ep. ad Rom.* cap. v.

[2] The thought ἵνα δυνηθῶ μαθητὴς εἶναι Θεοῦ, *Ep. ad Eph.* cap. i., does not contradict the other τότε ἔσομαι μαθητὴς ἀληθῶς Χριστοῦ, *Ep. ad Rom.* cap. iv.

[3] *Infra*, pp. 222 sq.

[4] The first of Peter, the three Pastoral Epistles, even Polycarp's *Ep. ad Phil.* cap. xii., are sufficient proof of the habit of exhorting to obedience toward Heathen governments in epistles of this kind; but Ignatius, *Ep. ad Eph.* cap. x., requires simply that *all men should be prayed for*, and that only because *repentance may be hoped from them, in order that they may come to God*; just as Xystus speaks about the same time (in Lagarde's *Anal. Syr.* p. 7. 14). How distinctly a recollection of this kind was connected with the name of Ignatius may be seen from the fact that the first augmenter and editor of his epistles in the

must give way to that of Christianity;[1] and if the previous great martyrs, Peter, Paul, and others, had fallen primarily in consequence of the Judeans instigating the Roman Government, his ardour now with the progress of time led him consistently to oppose the Roman supremacy itself. He was accordingly condemned by the governor of Antioch to fight with beasts, as guilty of treason. We can well suppose that then the church earnestly pleaded for an alteration of that sentence; but the governor could, if he was inclined to attend to this request, and the condemned man was vigorous enough to serve as a spectacle for the Roman people, only send him to Rome that it might there be seen whether he would be pardoned or not.[2] His conveyance to Rome with others who were destined for the same spectacle, or to be taken up on the way, was therefore determined. Of course Ignatius had fought with none but the truly Christian weapons of Divine truth and sincerity, and met with this punishment only because he first openly and boldly uttered the things which it still required two centuries to make triumphant in the world. And as what he uttered in Antioch with relation to the Roman Government could be maintained with perfect serenity in the hot conflict, because of its truth, though thereby the rage of his opponents was the more provoked, so upon his long terrible journey to death he everywhere exhibited a lofty calmness of soul. When he was about to pass from Antioch into Europe by way of Smyrna and Troas, he found an opportunity for writing a few words such as were suitable for this time to his younger friend Polycarp, the above-mentioned[3] Bishop of Smyrna, adding also a few words to the bishop's church.[4] From Smyrna, where his guards seem to have remained a considerable time, he had previously addressed a few words of genuine inspired enthusiasm to the Ephesian church, which had sent

seven Greek epistles makes no change in this respect. But the still later editor at length introduces a change apparently with purpose (*Epist. ad Philadelph.* cap. iv.; *ad Smyrn.* cap. ix.) With regard to the *Pastor Hermæ* in this respect, see below.

[1] A reminiscence of this has been preserved even in those late *Martyrologies* in which Ignatius is represented as contending quite openly in Antioch or even in Rome directly with Trajan *himself*. It is true these *Martyrologies* date only from the Byzantine period; but it was probably a reminiscence of the dangerous audacity of Ignatius which induced Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* v. 28. 4, to quote a beautiful passage from an epistle of our Ignatius without mentioning his name either here or elsewhere, and to speak of him here only as a Christian who was condemned to fight with beasts.

[2] We may infer this with tolerable certainty from the laws quoted by Bunsen, *Corpus Juris, Dig.* xlviii. 19. 31.

[3] *Ante*, p. 214.

[4] This is the first of the three epistles, and in this the first redactor found nothing to add. But towards the end this epistle has evidently been abbreviated in the Syriac collection of three, and has been in this respect better transmitted in the Greek.

him a greeting by its bishop, Onesimus.[1] When, as he then proceeded through Macedonia westwards, gradually approaching Rome, he found an opportunity of writing by a quicker route to the Roman church, he announced to them his speedy arrival; yet not with a view of authorising intercession for him at the court of Cæsar (a step to which undoubtedly many advised him), but to dissuade them from any such attempt: and at this point his mind exults with awful rapture in view of his near and certain death. He knows no higher joy, honour, or bliss than 'to be food of God, and to be ground by the teeth of wild beasts, and to be found pure bread of Christ,' alluding in such an entirely original way to the true Christian sacrifice;[2] let the wild beasts 'become his sepulchre in order that when he has fallen asleep he may be a burden to no one;' and then only does he hope 'to be truly Christ's disciple when the world will not so much as see his body.'[3] This is the language of one long absorbed in enthusiastic reflection on that horrible death on behalf of the most righteous cause, and language such as was perhaps never again written down in cold blood in this fashion. Thus he fell at last in Rome, an illustrious instance of the powerful and lasting influence of Paul's exalted example in the second and third generation after his martyrdom; for it is especially Paul's thoughts and words which, next to those of the Gospels,[4] continue to influence him with this wonderful force, much as he has become an entirely different character from Paul as regards his temporal and national position.

In this way Ignatius had become, in life and in death, the perfect model of a bishop such as these times required, and such as necessarily seemed more and more desirable in the following generations, when the trials and persecutions of the churches grew continually worse. While in him Christian faithfulness and steadfastness were in these times most fully exhibited, though but few dared to follow him in quite the same

[1] This is the second of the three, but it is in the Syriac evidently still more shortened, and especially, as in the former one, the conclusion is wholly wanting.

[2] Vol. vii. pp. 120 sq.

[3] Cap. iv., comp. cap. vii. This third and last epistle in the Syriac translation (at all events in the three MSS. of it hitherto discovered) has been preserved in the most complete form in the Syriac translation, yet not without some omissions. This is not the place to give the detailed proof of all this.

[4] Of these reminiscences of the Gospels the passage *Ep. ad Eph.* cap. xix. about the *tria mysteria clamoris* which were prepared in the silence of God, but remained hidden from the Devil (until they had taken place), points clearly to an apocryphal Gospel, and is only on that account obscure; but the Greek text has been preserved more perfectly than the Syriac. The meaning of these three μυστήρια, however, may be easily discovered.

form of conflict, the episcopal office and dignity, again, were especially exhibited in him as the ideal of the bishop who was then looked for, as one contending to the death in the front of his flock, and protecting them all by his nobler strength. After his martyrdom, accordingly, not only were his epistles immediately sought after with great eagerness,[1] but as having become so famous and precious they were subsequently repeatedly re-edited, and at last fictitious ones were added to them. His epistles have peculiar characteristics such as of themselves invite the efforts of later expounders and interpolaters, as they are written in an extremely concise style, liable to be easily misunderstood, while they are overflowing with inward force and highest enthusiasm. In addition to this, it was soon believed that certain necessities of the time could be most readily met by re-editing and augmenting them. In the decades immediately succeeding the martyrdom of Ignatius the necessity was felt of a more strict and centralised personal government of the churches, and with that a more complete constitution of the episcopal office: the increase of persecution from without, and the growing dangers from the action of the Gnostics within, made this want more painfully felt. Epistles of Ignatius, as the first high model of a bishop, appeared to be best adapted to teach what the true bishop and what the true unity and stability of the Church ought to be. Thus seven re-edited and enlarged Ignatian epistles were put in circulation, the chief object of which is twofold: (1) to exhort to a glad and strict obedience to the government of the church officers, particularly of the bishop; and (2) to warn, with equally strong words, against the schisms of the Gnostics especially. A few very slight sounds of these two kinds of admonition were to be found in Ignatius' own epistles;[2] but the editor appended his own strong emphasis to them, so that they have now a wholly different meaning. The Epistle to Polycarp, and that to the Romans, were left by the new editor almost unaltered, as their subject-matter offered little that was suitable for his purpose. But the five epistles to the churches of Asia Minor—the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Trallianians, the Philadelphians, and the Smyrnæans—he made in the highest degree monotonous by the perpetual repetition of a few alternate exhortations, after

[1] As may be certainly inferred from the passage above quoted from Polycarp's *Ep. ad Phil.* cap. xiii.

[2] In the Epistle to Polycarp, cap. v. vi., and in that to the Ephesians, cap. i., there are a few allusions to the episcopal office, but quite harmless ones, and called for by the context simply, and by no means so intentional as those of the first, still less of the second editor. It is the same with the allusions to the false teachers, *Ep. ad Polyc.* cap. iii.

the manner and order of the above-mentioned two principal ideas. In other respects he adheres pretty closely to his models, and likes to make everywhere new applications of certain characteristic phrases of Ignatius.[1] This first editor of the Ignatian epistles wrote undoubtedly rather early, whilst there was still much known of the martyr's history and friends through living tradition: so long, however, as the three genuine epistles (for they seem to have been early limited to this number) were much read, this edition of seven, which dates, at the latest, from the middle of the second century, does not appear to have been widely used.[2] Eusebius, in his time, knew only the edition of seven re-edited epistles.[3] But once more, somewhere about the time of the Nestorian and Monophysite controversies, some one again published these seven epistles, with fresh and large additions and changes, some of the epistles being wholly new and original compositions, though generally from the same motives essentially which had controlled the first editor, yet with much less delicate art.[4] And, later still, yet more ridiculous epistles were ascribed to Ignatius.[5]

From the time of Ignatius the episcopal office, constituting the strongest stay of the unity and the united government of each church, was everywhere regarded in the Church at large as established. In contrast with this unchangeable office, as regards its occupant, the college of presbyters, as representing the church, might easily have become less fixed, if such a change had been felt as at all needful in those times. Similarly, with the gradual decease of men of Apostolic rank, it remained in this period still more uncertain under what form the higher unity of all the individual churches would ultimately be secured.

[1] As *σοῦ ὀναίμην*, in which case undoubtedly Paul's words to Philemon, ver. 20, were present to the mind of Ignatius himself; further the expression of deepest love, so peculiar to Ignatius, *περίψημα ἐγώ σου*, which corresponds completely to the Arabic انا فداك, or فدتك نفسي, and has in 1 Cor. iv. 13 only a distant analogy; likewise the frequent formation of words in *-φόρος*, after the example of Theophorus. (*ante*, p. 216).

[2] The evidence of Origen (iii. p. 938, ed. de la Rue) on the passage *Ep. ad Rom.* cap. vii. is doubtful, as it is also found in the edition of three epistles; but otherwise all considerations are in favour of as early a date as the above for the edition of seven epistles.

[3] *Exc. Hist.* iii. 36. If it is the true view that the earlier and genuine collection contained only three epistles, it follows thence that Eusebius had the collection of seven before him, as he alludes to them even successively in their present order; moreover, he quotes the passage *Ep. ad Smyrn.* cap. iii., which beyond doubt first appeared in the revised edition.

[4] This is the collection of thirteen Greek epistles, which Petermann published after collating the Armenian translation of them, 1849.

[5] Such as the amusing ones above referred to, p. 216.

3. *The Final Form of the Relation of the Church to the World. Persecutions from the Heathen, and the Martyrs.*

The consideration of the subject-matter of the epistles of Ignatius, and of his end, may serve as a transition to the last point which has still to be looked at.

We have seen how perfectly, and with what universality of aspect, Christianity was now taking form as a philosophy and system of teaching, and how firmly it thus established its home amongst men. We have seen, also, how completely it now separated itself from the Ancient Community, and how characteristically, and yet with what secure foundations and permanent institutions, it consolidated itself as a society. Consolidating itself thus firmly and consciously, both in its views and convictions, and in its terrestrial institutions, it now, for the first time, realises more generally its own eternal significance and power, and recognises its divine necessity, in the course of the world's history, with that higher certainty which could spring from this immovable basis of thought and organisation alone. This is that calmly joyous certainty which is expressed most directly, absolutely, plainly, and beautifully in the writings of the Apostle John, and which, in another form, is nowhere expounded more adequately than in the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians. For when the inspired and enraptured glance now reviewed all history, from the most distant regions before Christ down to the most recent scenes after his coming, with the design of realising, with all assurance, the effects of his appearing, it must become clear to it that the entire history of mankind and of the spiritual world from the very first contemplated and tended towards the appearing of Christ, and to the salvation which was to be founded by him, and was now open to all men; and thereby a number of deepest enigmas of Divine thought and meditation in relation to the world appeared to be resolved.[1]

But, however imperishably Christ's kingdom had been established in the earth by its intrinsic truth and glory so short a time after his departure, it nevertheless confronted, until now, the rest of the human race only as another and profoundly hostile kingdom; moreover, the *kingdom of the world* continued to retain in its hand all political power, and, as based upon wholly different views and objects, could hardly for a time

[1] Eph. i. 4–11, following the shorter suggestions, Col. i. 14 sq., comp. John i. 1–18.

tolerate the existence of the kingdom of Christ in peace by its side. In fact, there was involved in this from the very first an insoluble and infinitely momentous difficulty in relation to all the past conceptions of men—a difficulty which necessarily came to the front more and more forcibly and glaringly in proportion as Christianity spread in the world and increased in strength and influence. The Church of Christ had, it is true, only a celestial Lord and King, whom the existing earthly governments might easily overlook or despise; but the Church, notwithstanding all its patience and serenity for the time, which now became habitual to it, was expecting every moment most intensely the immediate visible coming of this incomparable Lord in the glory due to him;[1] and it was the first and inalienable hope that at least when Christ should come in his glory he would erect externally his kingdom upon the ruins of that of the world. But even before the consummation of *that present age*,[2] the Christian Church already existed as a society complete in itself, in the form of a brotherhood bound together by similarity of faith, practice, and hope, as well as by the noblest fraternal affection, and a brotherhood which always voluntarily submitted to its own leaders in their proper order. This was itself an actual kingdom with its own most marked character and most decided purposes, by its construction and its deepest energies established infinitely more firmly than any of the existing human kingdoms, though as to its summit it was yet incomplete, inasmuch as it was still waiting for the visible presence of its Lord, and on that account submitting itself humbly and submissively to the violence of the existing earthly kingdoms. Moreover, as from the first founded by other than outward force, in accordance with its highest principle, it was never spread by the aid of material means; it was maintained and advanced solely by the same purely celestial love through the highest exertions of which it was called into life; and as on that account it was complaisant towards all men without exception and overcame its enemies by teaching and love alone, so it was especially obedient towards existing governments and respectful towards all that was good in them. At the same time this unfinished kingdom of Christ had its own deep, invincible will and spirit, which was totally opposed to the will and spirit of all other existing kingdoms; and it cherished a sacred hope, which anticipated, with enthusiastic assurance, their certain end; and though the individual members of this kingdom gladly submitted, in everything not contrary to their inmost faith, to the

[1] See *ante*, pp. 175 sq.

[2] ὁ αἰὼν ὁ οὗτος.

laws of the *kingdom of this world*, their highest love was necessarily elsewhere, and thereby an alienation must arise between the two absolutely different kingdoms, the effects of which that of the world soon either dimly, but with great dread, surmised or plainly perceived. For, in any case, there were many things required, or expected as reasonable, by the kingdom of the world which no good Christian could conscientiously perform. It was only under compulsion, in short, that a genuine Christian could submit to the acknowledgment of all its laws and practices without exception, particularly the heathenish worship of its princes, which Judeanism had already steadfastly refused; the appeal to its courts of justice in all civil causes; contributions to the maintenance of Heathen temples and priests; and the Judean doubt whether an Israelite might render military service in a Heathen army might be renewed in every Christian more strongly, inasmuch as Christ himself, as the Lord of peace and love, had himself warned his followers against taking the sword. And gentle as Christianity was in its inmost tendencies, and much as its teachers exhorted publicly to submission to the Heathen governments, the innate force of the deep incompatibility of the two kingdoms early broke out into bright flame in the case of some of the more daring spirits, as we have seen.[1]

As regards the Roman empire in particular, there were special causes in its case which made it so early the most bitter and irreconcilable persecutor of Christianity. For in the second and third generations Christianity had spread with growing rapidity, and taken ever deeper root throughout the countries of the empire; with perfect ingenuousness and without any arrogance, it could boast that it had been securely established throughout the whole earth,[2] and in some countries particularly all the Heathen temples already stood as if forsaken of their worshippers.[3] But although it had then undoubtedly spread rapidly into the countries on the eastern confines of the Roman empire,[4] as those countries had been so specially prepared to

[1] *Ante*, p. 218.

[2] As early as *Hermæ Pastor*, iii. 8. 3, the tree covering the whole earth, which in Dan. iv. 10–12 is still an image of the Heathen empire, has become the symbol of Christianity; comp. *Ep. ad Diogn. ante*, pp. 173 sq.

[3] The statement of Pliny, *Epist.* x. 97. 9, 10 supplies the best proof unintentionally of this: we have no reason to suppose that such phenomena were to be met with in that part of Asia Minor alone.

[4] We cannot, it is true, prove this from a general and connected history of those regions; but Christianity must have early established itself both in the north-east (vol. vi. p. 142) and in the far south-east, according to the evidence referred to *Jahrbb. der B. W.* ii. p. 201; with regard to the journeys of Thomas, see a brief account, *ibid.* iv. p. 128.

understand its true meaning and tendencies by the early extension of Judeanism in them, it is still undeniable that it was chiefly the Roman empire in which it most rapidly spread and obtained such a deep and uniform hold. This empire was really the world at that time; Christianity had arisen in it, and into the extensive countries thereof had poured itself in the tide of its first and freshest enthusiasm previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, when it was about to be restricted and held down within its own immediate confines; and as the great uniformity of the administration and government of these wide countries, no less than the outwardly legal habit of mind which as a rule prevailed in them, had now marvellously forwarded the spread of Christianity still more than previously the similar spread of Judeanism, so in the Roman empire a greater uniformity of external institutions and of the internal connection of the countless separate Christian churches might be constantly more fully developed.[1] But on this very account this most powerful of all existing Heathen empires necessarily came at once into hostile collision with Christianity; a collision which at first was shown involuntarily, and here and there only, in unconscious, obscure, and instinctive forms, but which at length came more strongly and consciously to the front, as the history of the empire down to the time of Constantine shows. In the earlier period, however, this empire of the world was at once impelled by a twofold motive to an uninterrupted and merciless persecution of this invincible faith, which seemed to spring so ghost-like from the strangest corners and depths of the earth, and the purposes of which seemed so unaccountable. The wisest, and in other matters most clear-sighted Romans continued to regard this faith as an *exitiabilis superstitio*.[2] For the Romans had scarcely time to congratulate themselves on having settled thoroughly with the Judeans, and on having delivered themselves from that spectral horror, when they beheld themselves tormented and mocked by this much worse ghost, which was from the first so closely related to the former one, and, indeed, seemed to have risen, only in a more terrible form, from its mortal agony. They accordingly only transferred the

[1] In consequence of its earliest development Christianity has continued almost down to our own times confined to the countries of the Roman empire, after it had conquered this empire with which it came into most immediate and sharp collision. I have elsewhere shown that it has long been needful that it should at length pass beyond these limits in a proper manner.

[2] Thus Tacitus in the reign of Trajan, *Ann.* xv. 44: and the judgment of Tacitus was only the same as that of all the Romans who regarded themselves as the truest and the best patriots, e.g. Trajan himself undoubtedly, and afterwards the philosopher Marcus Aurelius, in his *Meditations*, xi. 3.

deep hatred which they had displayed so bitterly against the haughty Judeans with tenfold bitterness to these Christian offshoots of Judeanism, who seemed so strangely patient and submissive, and were yet so indestructibly hardy and tenacious of existence. Moreover, the slanders and instigations which so many Judeans raised against Christianity, which they regarded as a faithless apostasy,[1] largely contributed undoubtedly to the formation of this view (now first fully established) of the Romans regarding the new religion of Christianity.

It cannot surprise us, therefore, that the Roman persecutions only now commence in earnest; and scarcely had the Christian churches become somewhat better protected against the Judean persecutions,[2] when they were assailed by those of the Romans, which might become much more extensive and severe than those of the Judeans had generally been. The first emperor who began them on a large scale was, according to all appearances, Domitian, that gloomy man, who suffered so much from the suspicion, peculiar to the Flavian family, of everything that came from Judea.[3] Christians and Judeans had then been generally quite separated, but the Roman Government was disinclined to acknowledge such a distinction,[4] treated the Christians as Judeans, and it could punish all Romans particularly who showed any inclination to Christianity the more rigorously as the severe laws of Vespasian against the Judeans were still in full operation. Thus, though Domitian might, in one of his better moods, send back the two relatives of Christ,[5] he caused many of the most severe punishments to be inflicted upon accused Christians.[6]

We have, however, from the time of Domitian, a somewhat more definite report of one case, which, on account of its special importance, remained somewhat more firmly fixed in the memory. A short time before his own fall the gloomy emperor commanded the execution of Flavius Clemens, the remaining son of his uncle Sabinus. The other son of Sabinus he had

[1] *Ante*, p. 46.

[2] *Ante*, p. 21.

[3] *Ante*, p. 77.

[4] As appears from the instance mentioned *ante*, p. 27, as well as from the way in which, according to Cassius Dio, *Hist.* lxvii. 14, the adoption of Judean customs by many Romans was then spoken of: for it is altogether improbable that a liking for Judeanism then suddenly increased in Rome.

[5] *Ante*, p. 188.

[6] E.g. execution and deprivation of property, see Cassius Dio, lxvii. 14, where these instances, which occurred under Domitian, are mentioned in a separate clause after the last instance of Flavius Sabinus; comp. also Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 12. 4; 37. 1 sq. Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 18 speaks much less definitely; somewhat more definitely, *Chron.* ii. p. 279; and we do not now know what is the authority for the statement in Tertullian's *Apology*, cap. v. quoted by Euseb. iii. 20, that Domitian soon recalled the condemned Christians; that he banished John to Patmos, as Tertullian says, is, we have seen, a baseless supposition, *ante* p. 170.

previously put out of the way, although he had adopted them both. He also banished the wife of Flavius Clemens, Domitilla, who likewise sprang from the Flavian house, to the island Pandateria, on the coast of Campania; they were both charged with atheism, that is, the violation of the Roman religion, by which all that can have been meant was an inclination to Christianity.[1] This member of the imperial family had just previously been invested, as one expression of the favour of Domitian, with consular dignity; but he was considered, in the opinion of the higher society of Rome, as a very inactive character,[2] undoubtedly because from love of a meditative and earnest Christian life, and probably also with a view of avoiding Domitian's suspicions, he wished to hold himself aloof from all public business; his wife (like so many other women of those first Christian times) may have been a more zealous Christian than he. This is the first pair belonging to such a high Roman family of whose Christian faith mention was from that time made; and a vivid recollection of both, and a still nobler son of theirs, appears to have been preserved in the Clementine fiction belonging to the end of the second century—the frequently re-edited book, which was so much read for the sake of its interesting story and published under various names, as the *Recognitions* or the *Homilies* of Clement, the ultimate purpose of which was stated above.[3] For it does not admit of doubt that by the Clement of Rome immortalised in it is meant the author of the epistle above described,[4] who according to an early order of enumeration was the third bishop of the church at Rome, and according to that order held his office from the twelfth year of Domitian to the third of Trajan:[5] the author had his own special purpose to serve in making him a disciple of Peter,[6] placing him at the same time in such an early period that he would then become, not the third, but the first Bishop of Rome. And when the author describes him as the son of a

[1] Cassius Dio, lxvii. 14; comp. on this *ante*, p. 80.

[2] For both points see Suet. *Dom.* cap. 15; comp. cap. 10; comp. also the allusions to all this by Philostratus in the *Life of Apollonius*, viii. 25. We have another proof that the Christians were everywhere much persecuted under Domitian in the declarations of several Christians before Pliny that they had abandoned Christianity twenty years before (*Epist.* x. 97. 6); but they were only the more timid Christians who after the first persecution had been more cautious.

[3] *Ante*, p. 126.

[4] *Ante*, pp. 205 sq.

[5] According to the simple statements in Irenæus, iii. 3. 3, Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* v. 6; iii. 2, 15, 21, 34. The first bishop was according to this list Linus, the second Anencletus. The readers of the later fiction regarding him first placed Clement at the head of the series.

[6] It is certain from the most reliable indications that Clement was a disciple of Peter; the error of the fiction is that it intentionally makes him a disciple of Peter alone, and not of Paul also.

godly mother, and of a father who was at first impeded by Heathen doubts, but at length converted, while both parents were of the imperial family,[1] all this may (notwithstanding the legendary conception of so much else, including even the names of the parents and brothers) very well be the remains of a true tradition concerning our imperial pair. If, however, Clement, the author of the epistle, was really a son of this couple,[2] he becomes from that fact the more interesting to us; and the relation would also explain why he should afterwards become so exceptionally famous and beloved as a most distinguished Roman presbyter and writer. For, with the exception of the few chief apostles, to no other Christian were so many writings subsequently ascribed,[3] and none of the disciples of the apostles was so early and so greatly as he glorified by tradition. And Christians of the most dissimilar schools contributed to this glorification.

The reaction which took place, after Domitian's fall, under the brief and mild reign of Nerva, was of benefit, undoubtedly, to the persecuted Christians also; and for some years Christianity could spread without restraint. But under the sternly warlike reign of Trajan, Roman suspicion at once rose proportionally higher, so that soon after his accession Christians became for the first time the objects of a general and extremely severe penal legislation. We no longer know the precise occasion of it; probably the urgent demands of the Judeans, who breathed more freely after the fall of the Flavian dynasty, for a strict separation of the Christians from themselves, concurred with the more public action of such Christians as Ignatius;[4] and

[1] See particularly *Homil.* xii. 8. If the original conclusion of the story had been preserved, all these points would have been more clearly brought out.

[2] The facts that Irenæus and Eusebius who follows him say nothing about the relationship, and that in the earliest mention that we have of his labours as a Roman presbyter (*Hermæ Pastor*, i. 2. 4, where he appears as an elder of distinction) he is called simply Clemens, can prove nothing against it. The confusion of him with the Clement whom Paul speaks of (Phil. iv. 3) as his former fellow labourer at Philippi begins with Eusebius, and is then continued by Jerome, *De Scriptoribus Eccles.* cap. 15.

[3] As far as we can at present classify the later literature ascribed to Clement, there belonged to it (1) the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which, however, differs completely from his genuine first epistle in language even, and is without any reason ascribed to him (see below); (2) the *two Epistles on Virginity*, i.e. the ascetic life; they were last published in the Syriac translation of them in 1856 (by J. P. Beelen, Lovan.). I have shown at length, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1856, pp. 1451–1469, in relation to this and similar questions generally, that they were written towards the end of the third century in Clement's name; (3) as Clement was looked upon as a strict Christian and beloved disciple of the apostles, a share in the authorship of books under such names as Διδαχή, *Didascalia*, or *Constitutiones* and *Canones* of the apostles, was ascribed to him, see *ante*, p. 201; (4) latest of all Apocalypses were ascribed to him, a lengthy report on which, by Dillmann, has been published in the *Gött. Gel. Nachrichten*, 1858, pp. 185–226. The work of which an account is given there is probably the same as that mentioned in Nicoll's *Catal. Cod. Man. Bibl. Bodl.*, pp. 49 sq.

[4] See *ante*, pp. 217 sq.

as, therefore, they were no longer to be thrown into the general class hitherto called Judeans, the earlier laws against the prohibited associations were put in force against Christianity, according to which, as being an illicit society (or *hetæria*), it was not to be tolerated, and all who openly professed it were to be treated as guilty of treason. Accordingly, when, in consequence of the scourge of delators, with which the Roman empire was afflicted, the courts of justice were soon flooded with public accusations against the Christians, both in Rome[1] and in all the provinces cruel tortures and sanguinary punishments were commenced, those accused persons only being liberated who consented to offer sacrifices before the idols and images of the Cæsars and to curse Christ. As the younger Pliny in Bithynia loathed the torture and execution of the immense multitude of the accused, Trajan, in reply to his elaborate, and for us historically most instructive report, gave him permission to punish those only who obstinately refused, when convicted of the crime of being Christians, to show any repentance; neither were they to be inquired after by the authorities.[2] But this only increased the activity of the anonymous informers. And in Palestine especially the persecutions rose to such a height that, on the representations of Tiberianus, his representative in this province, Trajan commanded that greater leniency should be shown.[3]

Trajan's successor, Hadrian, is commended, before the end of his life, it must be allowed, by a semi-Christian, an adherent of that hybrid faith above described,[4] as an exceedingly good emperor;[5] and undoubtedly he endeavoured more than Trajan to be just to all classes of his innumerable subjects by a personal view and examination of matters. In fact, such an internal warfare as had been commenced by Trajan's instructions, whereby the perpetual disturbance and persecution of the most innocent and best subjects were open to public informers and sycophants, might become a source of the greatest peril to the empire, which the best governors and emperors themselves must have been the first to perceive. Moreover, the emperors and the governors were in the habit, according to ancient Roman custom, of paying ready attention to the clamorous voices and demands of the populace—for instance, when it was collected at the public games—so that a popular tumult merely

[1] When Pliny says (*Epist.* x. 97. 2): *Cognitionibus de Christianis interfui nunquam*, he can only mean that he was never present in Rome itself when such cases were tried.

[2] *Epist.* x. 98. 2; it follows from x. 42, 43, that the laws against the *hetæriæ* had long been in existence.

[3] The trace of this has been preserved in *Suidas, s.v.* Τραϊανός.

[4] *Ante*, pp. 122 sq.

[5] See my *Abhandlung* on the Sibylline Books, pp. 63 sq. 67.

often cost many Christians their lives. When, therefore, a proconsul of Asia, Serennius Granianus, had sent a true report to Hadrian of this evil, which was doubly inconvenient in a country that had become to such an extent Christian as Asia Minor then had, the emperor commanded Fundanus, the successor of the proconsul, to punish those Christians only who should be convicted of having acted 'contrary to the laws,' to pay no attention to merely hostile representations and tumultuous proceedings, and to punish the base sycophants;[1] and the emperor sent similar instructions to other districts.[2]

But no such efforts of individual Roman governments were able to produce any permanent improvement, as the opposition and conflict between Christianity and Heathenism had already found its way into the heart of the people at large. After so many of their martyrs had fallen, Christians learned to celebrate every year afresh the days of their death in a fixed order;[3] but this was only an extension and perpetuation of the annual Passover feast in its new and genuinely Christian sense. In this way also 'the people of the Christians' soon formed a new nation of the earth; and the people generally in all parts of the world observed sooner than the governments that the Christians were an entirely new class of men, and that Christianity and Heathenism could not exist side by side.

Thus with the Judeans many Heathen also opposed Christianity incessantly, urged the governments in a thousand ways to punish, or rather to exterminate, the Christians, and obtained everywhere, more or less, their purpose; and upon every lull or exhaustion of the endless conflict it broke out afresh and with increased violence, now in one place and then in another. Heathens and Judeans, and often semi-Christians in other respects, attacked the Christians with the same animosity; many drew back from fear, either entirely or in appearance; but to become like Christ in the death of martyrdom became

[1] This decree of Hadrian is given in Justin's *Apol.* i. cap. 68 in the Latin; Meliton also refers to it in his lost Apology, a passage from which is preserved in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 26. 10. As there is here only a general reference to the 'laws,' and Christianity is not spoken of as an illicit association, the decree leaves great liberty to the benevolent judge: on the other hand, a crime might be discovered in the simple denial of the Roman gods.

[2] According to Meliton's brief remark in the passage referred to above. Meliton wished that the Christians had been treated as they were at the beginning of Christianity, i.e. as the Judeans then were throughout the empire; and it is only because he takes this view of the situation, and in so far emphasises the close connection of Christianity with Judeanism, that he can say that only Nero and Domitian had previously as persecutors of Christianity made an exception from the laws of Augustus; to which we must undoubtedly add that he was unwilling publicly to say anything bad of the Cæsars after Domitian.

[3] Comp. the first beginnings of this custom, vol. vii. p. 163.

more and more the prevailing impulse and often the deep desire of all who truly believed; and if some in fear shrank from an open confession, others, on the contrary, announced themselves to the governments, lest they should be deceived and to satisfy their own consciences, and also mainly under the influence of the passionate desire to be in death itself like Christ.[1] But neither the partial nor the complete denial of Christianity, which occurred in the case of many, could be lightly viewed in any of its churches from the inmost nature of Christianity; and when the martyrs came to be esteemed above all,[2] there arose a number of new questions as to the view to be taken of those who had more or less fallen away.

The Shepherd of Hermas.

We possess still a work of considerable size belonging to the same period, and one which enables us to take the most instructive glances into all the internal affairs of the Church in this respect, and to form an idea of the Church itself. We refer to the Shepherd of Hermas, which was once extremely popular, and is also remarkable as being one of the last, not wholly unworthy and rapidly widely circulated, offshoots of Biblical literature, and which was not without a considerable influence upon the formation of Christian ideas.

The work is occupied mainly with one series of related questions which at that time rapidly became of great importance, and with regard to which no satisfactory answers in detail had yet been given. What is Christian repentance and forgiveness, and how can the latter be shared by those who are about to undergo the great purification of baptism, or have even already undergone it, and ought thereby to be kept from every heinous transgression? The work enters minutely into all such questions, but this is hardly the place to follow its treatment of them in detail; it may suffice to observe that the author, in consideration of the severe persecutions and the great injuries they inflicted on the churches, proposes a view of the possibility

[1] Justin, *Apol.* ii. cap. 12.

[2] This is quite the case already in *Hermæ Pastor*, i. 3. 1, 2, 5; iii. 9. 3, 8, 28, in Xystus' *Eclogæ* (in Lagarde's *Anal. Syr.* p. 6. 13–20; 8. 18, 19; 17. 4, 5), in Justin's *Dial. c. Try.* cap. 46. Although the Martyrologies of Ignatius are all of late date (*ante*, p. 219) and may hardly be quoted here, the accounts of the end of Polycarp (in Dressel's *Patres Apost.* 2nd ed. pp. 391 sq. [*Martyrium S. Polycarpi*]) and of the great persecution in Vienna and Lugdunum under Marcus Aurelius (in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* v. 1–4) are quite contemporary and supply the most faithful historical examples, short and extremely touching as they are; it is true they belong to a somewhat later period, but they may still be referred to for an instructive picture of the persecutions under Domitian and Trajan.

or impossibility of the restoration of the various classes of the apostates which, notwithstanding its rigour, appeared to later times too lax; so that the Montanists, as if in opposition to this book, which was then much read and followed, afterwards put forward their much more rigorous view.[1] But Christians to whom a special kind of penance was or seemed necessary at that time constituted a large part of the Church, whilst the position of Christianity in the world was still everywhere very insecure, and the most violent storms both from without and from within assailed it; and our author has especially an open eye for the general significance of the Church in the world. Further, repentance and penance, conceived as the condition of a Christian life, are so closely connected with all the other states of mind, views, and deportment of a Christian that they can be properly considered only in a wide connection of this kind; but our author delights to peer deeply into all the inner conditions of the mind, to bring into light these most sacred feelings of the single soul in relation to the great and rigorous Christian requirement, and to propound definite views on all the dark and doubtful points which in such cases arose. Now, no one had more occasion to meditate on all these things fully and to form definite conclusions regarding them than the officer who was entrusted with the direction of a Christian church, who had at that time so much power over the consciences of the ordinary Christians, which, however, was a purely spiritual power, and who was a member of the whole line of church governors on whose action the entire fate of Christendom chiefly depended. Our author was evidently a director of this kind, or, as he is described in the higher language of his book, a *pastor*;[2] and as he sought to become master of the innumerable doubts and uncertainties which arose in these circumstances, he wrote, when he could at last hope to have overcome them, this elaborate work for the use of the whole church of his day.

If the author was to attain his object completely, his work had necessarily to contain a mixture of doctrine and outlook: the doctrine had to show the nature of true repentance and penance, and what could conduct to and promote them; the outlook into the nature of the Church generally and its ultimate future had to teach what was the purpose of true repent-

[1] It is, however, quite baseless and wrong to bring the date of our book down to the times of the Montanists.

[2] The name according to iii. 6. 1 sq. denotes simply a director, or governor, in accordance with the usage of the prophetic language of the Old Testament; but the fact that our author again gives such prominence to it, and calls Christ himself by this name, was occasioned less by such passages as 1 Pet. ii. 25, Heb. xiii. 20, Eph. iv. 11, than by John x. 1 sq., since he takes from this passage the image of the *door* also, see below.

ance, and what divine glory awaited both all Christians individually and the universal kingdom of Christ. Now, as in the Old Testament prophets, doctrine and outlook had always been closely conjoined, and especially such later prophets as Ezekiel had succeeded in connecting both in a beautifully artistic manner, so our author also endeavours to combine both after the prophetic model. In this effort he was assisted by the Book of Ezra,[1] the most recent and attractive work of the kind, and an admirable model; and he follows it in many points of art, as far as a purely Christian can imitate a Judean work which was not much older. Although a very good and decided Christian, not having the remotest inclinations toward the Judean Christians in the bad sense above described,[2] he was yet, according to all indications, of Judean extraction, so that everything belonging to the Old Testament was quite at his command, as regards its language and figures; indeed, his Greek has a strong Hebrew flavour. Moreover, like the author of the Book of Ezra, he undoubtedly lived and wrote in Rome, was, from all that we can infer from his work, in Italy only quite at home, and sprang, therefore, probably from the stock of Judean families which had then long been settled in Rome.[3] This Christian prophetic work resembles the Book of Ezra in this respect also, that its author and his ideas retreat behind the memory of an older universally honoured saint, and that it represents all that it has to say from the basis of his life and history alone.

The choice of such a saint must have been somewhat difficult to the author. On the one hand, he could make none but a Christian the mouthpiece of his work, yet not one of the most prominent—a Peter, or another apostle, or even a Clement—he needed a simple *pastor* or presbyter of a Christian church, who, as the careful director of a single church, might be regarded as a pattern for all similar officers. On the other hand, as the action of the work had to be placed in Rome—and he had this great important church primarily in view—he could choose none but an elder from this church who had, in the recollection of all, once distinguished himself, and had become known probably as a man given to prophetic musings and inquiries. He chose accordingly as his representative pastor, given to prophetic thought and action, *Hermas*, a (to us) otherwise unknown

[1] *Ante*, pp. 47 sq.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 143 sq.

[3] An antithesis between Christian and Judean elements, which comes out so prominently in other writings of this and still more of the following period, is accordingly never dwelt upon in the long, well-preserved work; and yet its author is unmistakably a very good and faithful Christian.

member of the Roman church,[1] but who had been certainly one of its presbyters,[2] and might still be very well known on account of his meditative nature. Above all, it could subsequently never be forgotten that at last he fell as one of the martyrs in Rome.[3] It is further evident that at the time of Clement[4] he was one of the presbyters of the great church there, as the author speaks of him as if Clement the bishop had been in his day officially connected with him, and a certain Grapte, otherwise unknown to us, had been the first female officer of the church.[5] Supposing, therefore, which we may very well do,[6] that the author regarded the year 95 A.D. as the time of the greatest activity of this Hermas, he may have written his book some ten or twenty years later,[7] when Hermas, Clement, and Grapte had long been dead, whilst the memory of the peculiar character and the unusual activity of Hermas had still been so well preserved that it could be easily revived. All this forms merely the literary art of the plan and execution of the work, but must be correctly understood as art in all its relations, if we wish to properly appreciate the book; whilst, some half century later, the art and the subject-matter of the work were

[1] In later times, as Origen in his *Comm.* on Rom. xvi. 14, and Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 3. 6 show, it was believed that he was the Hermas mentioned in Rom. xvi. 14, but evidently as a purely erroneous guess: the name Hermas or Hermes was frequent enough in those times, and both are mentioned Rom. xvi. 14 even.

[2] It is in accordance with this supposition that the plan of the whole book is laid and in detail executed: but when children, the numerous family, perhaps also the wife or the sister (according to early Christian language) of Hermas are spoken of (as i. 1. 3; 2. 2, 3; iii. 7. 1), all this is to be understood in the higher sense which is implied in the whole meaning of the book, and which was elsewhere customary in those times (see *Johanneische Schriften*, i. pp. 510 sq.). The household of this pastor and his children are the members of his great church. Of pastors as governors of the churches much is said iii. 6. 1 sq.

[3] This follows from the clear indication given when he is described as living at Rome and yet not ripe for taking his place of honour amongst the martyrs, i. 3. 1. Whoever understands the style of books of this kind will easily perceive that we have here merely a hint of what subsequently actually occurred, and the coming of which is immediately touched upon more particularly, i. 4. 1.

[4] *Ante*, p. 228.

[5] i. 2. 4. Clement, who is to send this new prophetic book to the churches without, is therefore the bishop of the Roman church, the bishop, as representative of his church, receiving the epistles addressed to it and sending them to other churches; it is of no importance that he is not called bishop in this connection; but this name occurs in its proper order in the series of officers, *episcopi*, *doctores* (i.e. presbyters), *ministri* (i.e. deacons), i. 3. 5. The name 'presbyters' is likewise rare in this book as less poetical; yet they are meant by the *priores ecclesiæ*, i. 2. 4; 3. 9, in the second early Latin translation in Dressel's edition; and it appears from i. 2. 4 that Hermas was one of them. Grapte is to read the book to the widows and orphans; she was therefore probably the head of the widows' institute (*ante*, p. 201), if the deaconesses had in that church to look after the sick only.

[6] According to p. 205 *ante*.

[7] According to the indication, iii. 9. 15, 'the apostles and (first) ministers of the Gospel,' the number of which is here remarkably given as forty, were already dead: this could be said about 115 A.D., and indeed almost as well about 95 A.D., and we have nowhere any proof that the book was not written until after 110 or 120 A.D.

sorely misconceived by people who, on other grounds, thought lightly of it.[1] It must be allowed that the art of this work fails to rise to the height of that of its model, the Book of Ezra, and is only cast round the great multitude of doctrines and anticipations of the most varied nature like a loose and quite transparent garment; in this respect also we perceive in this book one of the last more vigorous offshoots of a class of literature which we may briefly call, in relation to this age particularly, Biblical. But the great matter in this connection also is to properly perceive both the nature of the literary art and the subject-matter of the work.

To Hermas, as he is so often waiting in profound meditation for Divine instructions, his own better spirit (or his angel) often comes as *pastor* to his assistance, preaches to him Divine truths and shows him Divine mysterious symbols, attends him and never forsakes him until he has finished his higher Divine work in the way needed by his time; and he is more definitely the *pastor of repentance*,[2] in the form in which he acts in this work in teaching and illuminating the Church. But as the mere man Hermas must disappear before this his better self, so he is really committed to this his immediate pastor only by the chief Pastor of all, that is, by Christ himself, who appears to him, however, only in the form of his Angel, and from whom everything in this relation ultimately proceeds.[3] These two angels, however, are only as the principal spirits which attend Hermas, and appear only after other spirits, in their order, in an ascending scale, and with an increase of their number and influence, have prepared the way. For at first there appears to him only the spirit of an earthly woman, whom he had once loved, in order to provoke in him sad repentance; and then on two occasions, with increasing force, an entirely different woman appears to teach him by lectures and to prepare for him a book which is to be circulated in every way immediately after he has written it;[4] and after it has been shown that this angelic woman is

[1] The author of the Muratorian *Fragmentum de Canone*, and some other Latin authors following him, wished to make a Hermas, brother of Pius, who was Roman bishop in the middle of the second century, the real author of the work, but evidently simply because they no longer set a high value upon it, and sought therefore to be able to represent it as a recent book; as we see most plainly from Tertullian after he had become a Montanist, *De Orat.* cap. 16, *De Pudic.* capp. 10, 20. But whoever has any true conception of the book will readily perceive that the author makes use of Hermas, as speaking and acting, purely as a literary artifice, making him a presbyter under Clement; so that such a late date for the book is inconceivable.

[2] *Pastor nuntius* (i.e. angelus) *pœnitentiæ* is his complete name.

[3] According to ii. *proœmium*, iii. 9. 1; 10. 1. An Angel of Christ, is met with in the Apocalypse also, a book which our author does not refer to, and probably was not acquainted with.

[4] i. 1. 2.

the Church herself, she soon appears to him again to manifest herself to him fully in all her wonderful nature;[1] but when afterwards a monster is about to devour him, she appears to comfort and save him, both being signs and symbols of great future trials that will come upon him, and from which nothing but true repentance can save him.[2] He is thus prepared for receiving the higher revelation of those two angels themselves, that he may commit it like that of the angelic woman to writing for the use of all;[3] and immediately the angelic pastor of repentance communicates to him very lengthy exhortations to Christian virtues, which, however, extremely various as they are, in the end are closely connected with the question concerning repentance and penance.[4] But as all spiritual things, and especially matters relating to eternal justice and the last judgment, may be expressed most clearly by the aid of symbols, the exhortation gradually changes into a description of various symbols, which are shown and explained to him by the same angel one after another.[5] But as a great symbolic representation of the Church was given at the opening of the book, so, at the end of it, the same angel appears once more to explain to him a similar but far more complete representation of it;[6] while the second and higher angel comes to close the whole with a few final admonitions.[7]

The above is a brief outline of the true contents of this comparatively extensive work in its various sections. But the author, in conformity with the prophetic plan of his work, seeks, as far as possible, to bring everything into the form of round

[1] i. 3, the earlier part of the *visio*.

[2] i. 4. The angel *Tegri*, who will vanquish all monsters, i. 4. 2, derives his name of 'Represser' from a very rare Syriac root ܛܓܪ, comp. ضجر, from which we have ܐܬܛܓܪ, Luke iii. 14 in the *Variata* [Cureton's ancient Syriac version of Four Gospels], but transposed with ܥܫܩ. This Tegri is still found in the second early Latin translation in Dressel (and also, as has since been found, in the Ethiopic translation and in the *Codex Sin.*), and Jerome (*Comment. ad Habac.* i. 14) read by mistake *Tyri* instead, of which he could make ridicule; *Hegrin*, found in the ordinary text, is also incorrect. The *Campanian road*, iv. 1, appears according to the *Codex Sin.* to be correct, though the Ethiopic has another reading.

[3] ii. *proœmium*, which is called in ancient authorities more correctly *Visio quinta*, and we should quote as i. 5.

[4] ii. 1–12; what is usually called the book of *Mandata*; of these the second ancient Latin translation in Dressel's edition (p. 409) gives twelve as the number, and this number appears to have been intentional; but quite arbitrarily he and others in our day divide the third book into ten *Similitudines*

[5] iii. 1–8; for to this point everything is closely connected, whilst with iii. 9. 1 evidently quite a new section begins.

[6] iii. 9, the longest single piece.

[7] iii. 10. The present division of the work and the names of its component parts are therefore not the most admirable. If we wished to divide it according to the pieces which are in themselves distinct, it would be found to consist of ten of them: (1) i. 1; (2) i. 2; (3) i. 3; (4) i. 4; (5) ii. *proœm.*–iii. 1; (6) iii. 2–4; (7) iii.; 5 (8) iii. 6–8; (9) iii. 9; (10) iii. 10. But

numbers, and although he employs the number seven,[1] he prefers, as one of his peculiarities, the numbers ten and twelve, with divisions of them,[2] probably because the number of the apostles and of the tribes of Israel was for him typical. It is often as if he desired to substitute a Christian series of sacred ideas for the Judean, as when he classes together seven Christian virtues.[3] And as his book, notwithstanding its prophetic plan, is very easy and pleasant reading, we can understand how, with its no less varied than interesting and instructive novel subject-matter, it was soon very widely read, and for a time placed amongst the Biblical books.[4]

But for us, at this point, the most important thing is the view the author takes of the Church of Christ; and in this respect we can easily perceive what important advances the view of it had made in the short interval since the publication of the Epistle to the Ephesians.[5] It is to our author, according to a new symbol, an immense tower which rises into the heavens, but which is still in building, and, mainly on account of the sins of so many Christians, lacks its final completion.[6] This tower is, as it were, of one stone, and yet, at the same time, composed of an endless number; but only such stones as are suitable for its style of architecture, and are not rejected by the architect, are permanently its true members; and the chief point is to carefully distinguish between the extremely different classes of genuine or spurious, faithful or unfaithful, and higher or lower Christians. The Church is also compared to a great distant city:[7] yet the figure of the tower is the favourite one,

with this division we can at the same time separate three main sections.

[1] It is remarkable that he supposes seventy saints of the Old Testament (ten of the first age, according to Gen. v., twenty-five just men of the next age, and thirty-five prophets, kings, and priests) and forty of the New Testament (apostles and other evangelists), and makes all of these the foundations of the tower of the Church, iii. 9. 4, 15.

[2] Six, eight, and four, see iii. 9. 2, 3, 15, and elsewhere.

[3] i. 3. 8; 12, but iii. 9. 15.

[4] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iv. 20. 2, quotes it simply as 'scripture,' and Clement of Alexandria speaks of it similarly, *Strom.* i. 17, 29; ii. 1; Origen, on the other hand, περὶ ἀρχῶν, iv. 11, as well as Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 3. 25, comp. v. 8, speak gradually more and more doubtfully regarding the estimation of the book. The text of the book has been in many passages better preserved in the second early Latin translation given in Dressel's *Patres Apost.* than in the Latin translation previously known, whilst the Ethiopic translation has now appeared (1860, comp. on it *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1860, pp. 1401–1412) and the Greek itself is at last accessible; in the enlarged edition of Dressel's *Patres Apost.* (1863) Tischendorf gives the readings of the *Codex Sin.* also, of which unfortunately, however, only about the first third of the book has been preserved. It is only when all these accessible sources have been combined that we can restore a good text and that the book can be properly studied. [Improved editions since Dressel's second are Gebhardt and Harnack's, 1877, Funk's, 1878, Hilgenfeld's 2nd ed. 1882.]

[5] *Ante*, pp. 190 sq.

[6] i. 3. 2 sq.; iii. 9. 1, 5 sq. and quite at the end it is referred to with great emphasis, iii. 10. 4.

[7] iii. 1. 1.

and is worked out at length in very various ways. Hermas seeks especially to combine with the chief figure, as well as he is able, the magnificent images of Christ as the rock and the door,[1] inasmuch as they were traditional. And although Hermas beholds this immense tower, which is destined ultimately to fill the world, building before his eyes, the Church, nevertheless, is considered by him as existing from the commencement of the world, and as the object for which the world was created;[2] so inseparable has the idea of the Church become with that of Christ himself, of whom all this was first said.

Higher ideas of the Church cannot be formed, unless one is prepared to fall into the destructive errors of the subsequent Papacy. According to Hermas, the Church is nothing less than the world and the realm of eternal salvation, founded upon Christ, built and directed by his Spirit. It is the one happy world; but whilst the book has much to say about the *nations without*, or simply the *nations*—that is, the Heathen—and puts them all in opposition to the Church,[3] it speaks nowhere of the attitude which Christians ought to assume towards them if they at any time became supreme in the earth, and nowhere of obedience to the existing temporal kingdoms. This silence is as significant in this as in the case previously mentioned;[4] and when we remember that this work was written in Rome and sent thence into all Christian churches, the silence is the more eloquent. If the Church, as the one true home of eternal salvation, thus places itself in simple antithesis to the kingdom of the nations, it can very well suffer whatever they inflict upon it; and steadfastness in all such sufferings, though they should be martyrdom itself, is the highest attainment according to this book.[5] But can such suffering be in the end the one highest thing? Can and ought this simple rigid antithesis between Christianity and Heathenism to be perpetuated for ever? And if at last the Heathenism in a country finds itself in the situation that no one desires to be or can be any longer a Heathen, what is to be done then?

We have reached here the limits of that age, as well as those

[1] iii. 9. 2–4, 12, comp. i. 3. 4; the figure of the door from John x. 1–9; the figure of the rock, which is really not harmonious, is taken undoubtedly from an apocryphal gospel.

[2] i. 2. 4, comp. 1. 3.

[3] *Exteræ gentes*, or simply *gentes* (both terms interchange often, in the various translations also), i. 1. 4; iii. 1. 1; 3. 4; 8. 9 and elsewhere.

[4] *Ante*, p. 218.

[5] But it is remarkable that the author, iii. 9. 28, 29, at last in carefully distinguishing the twelve classes of Christians (for he makes as many classes as this) places above the martyrs, who are the eleventh class, those who are 'as wholly pure and innocent as children,' as if history had convinced him that men like the Apostle John, though they had not died amongst the host of martyrs, might perhaps reach a still higher degree of glory; comp. *ante*, p. 169.

of the Christian wisdom of that time. But prophetic foreboding and hope necessarily passed these limits, and sought to peer into the long future; and in the previous age the Apocalypse had more plainly and openly taught than it was now, in the greatly altered circumstances, thought safe publicly to teach, that Christianity would ultimately completely triumph over Rome —that is, Heathenism.[1] But not even the boldest and truest prophecy had as yet been able to declare in detail what was to be the attitude of Christianity towards the world, when it had once obtained the supremacy in the Roman or any other empire; still less when this had been accomplished with regard to all non-Christian nations and empires.

Conclusion.

For no section of the history of Christianity subsequent to Christ's appearing closes in such a way that a great and serious vital question, in addition to perhaps many smaller ones, has not to be left to a following section to be answered, so long as the entire development of human history on the earth has not been passed through, and there still remains something of magnitude which has first to be penetrated and permeated by the Christian spirit. As this rule has been exemplified throughout the course of the Christian ages, and as we have still to contend with perplexing problems, peculiar to our time, and pressing specially upon our age and our really or apparently highly cultured countries, so we find this was the case with those early Christian times. Nothing is therefore more baseless and erroneous, or more injurious and misleading, than to suppose that everything about which we have still to inquire, and which may torment and weigh upon us, was already settled in those primitive times. Christ himself had first to be crucified in order that it might be decided in the Apostolic age what was the true and eternal significance of his work on earth. The Apostolic age had to go by, and Jerusalem with its Temple had to fall that the question which first arose in that age might be decided, whether Christianity should continue to be bound to the Ancient Community and its way of keeping the ancient Law. And now this second age after Christ passes away with especially one wholly new and perplexing question which had first to be started in it, but could not be settled during its course— the question of the relation of the Church of Christ, which had only just become quite independent in the world, to earthly

[1] Vol. vii. p. 528.

kingdoms. During the last seventy years infant Christianity had advanced so as to be able to take up a mortal conflict with Heathenism, as the existing kingdom of the world, and with Rome as its strongest power; each of its separate churches had already, by means of the episcopal office, developed that stricter unity which was called for by a conflict with foes without of this description, and already the first bishop who represented these two forms of progress, Ignatius, had fallen as a martyr. But thereby the great vital question was only so far started that it could never rest again until it was solved; it was projected into the distant spaces of the long future, which was now opening before the feet of Christianity, after it had been made a secure citizen of the world, that it might receive from Constantine its first solution, which, however, can no longer satisfy our age.

Scarcely a century after the advent and work of Christ, therefore, Christianity was already rapidly advancing to contest the supremacy with the empires of the world; in such a short period, whilst suffering under the greatest obstruction and oppression of the time, it had become, as it were, the vigorous youth to whom, by a higher destiny, the supremacy of the world is about to fall, and who enters upon the hidden future prepared to perish unless he succeeds in making it his own. And although it goes to meet that future with this new and difficult question unsolved, it has already obtained in the age under review the great and certain advantage of complete separation from its own maternal home, and therewith true independence and freedom. It has completely released itself from the Ancient Community both in doctrinal conceptions and in the development of its church-life, and now for the first time exists as the perfectly matured offshoot which was destined to spring from the decayed trunk of the community of the ancient true religion, to come back as from Paradise to the earth as the tree of life of perfect true religion: and all this was accomplished before the final blow fell upon the Ancient Community, of which we shall have to speak below.

THE LITERARY ACTIVITY OF THE CHURCH.

Historical Works.—Epistles.

With what indefatigable no less than calmly intelligent zeal Christianity sought during this entire period to consolidate itself, and with what absolutely Divine confidence it constantly looked forward to the future and back into the past, we can, in

the last place, perceive most plainly from the literature which, after its origin in the previous period, was now further developed with the most remarkable rapidity, consistency, and productivity. It necessarily bears on it still the marks of outward straits and the oppression of the world, from which at that time everything Christian continued to suffer. Its productions are as formerly almost exclusively works of the moment, called forth by the necessities of the immediate hour, brief in plan and execution, the longest of them sent forth into the world in small volumes, and most of them only as loose leaves. But already this literature expands itself according to all the forms and possibilities of literary art, as if the Christian mind were now learning with growing rapidity and success to avail itself of all the powers of human speech and literary expression for its own lofty ends. The most marked sign of this new enterprise is the liberty which so many authors take of writing in the names of one or another of the distinguished deceased Christians; a liberty which gradually becomes simple literary art,[1] but which at first arose rather from the pure necessities of the time.[2] And this literature, with its wholly new subject-matter and with its (for that world) extraordinary tones, grew constantly in the extent and character of the matters dealt with, although there was as yet little leisure for the origination of a strictly learned literature.

But the less opportunity there was for the rise of learning in the strict sense, the more this literature—at all events in the case of its finest examples—abounded in the intrinsic force and concentration of absolute truth; as if, without wishing to be prophetic, it was still quickened by a genuine prophetic vein and, as in the case of Christ's utterances, almost at every step beat higher under the influence of Divine assurance. But as the Apostolic age had produced so many of the finest Christian writings, and the stream of them was still flowing, this literature invigorated itself not only by resorting to the books of the Old Testament, but already to a great extent lived upon the exalted and immortal truths of the utterances and thoughts of earlier Christian works, particularly of those which seemed, in consequence of the intervening destruction of Jerusalem, to be removed into a wholly different age. Yet in the use of these two classes of books the great distinction is observed that, while the writers

[1] E.g. in the case of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, *ante*, p. 234.

[2] E.g. in the case of the Epistle to the Ephesians, *ante*, pp. 190 sq., the three Pastoral Epistles, *ante*, pp. 198 sq., the second of Peter, *ante*, pp. 180 sq.; and it was undoubtedly in this order that these epistles appeared.

of this later literature often characterise the truths which they take from the Old Testament as communicated in the Sacred Scriptures or simply in the *Scripture*, they reproduce the earlier Christian utterances simply as they happen to be re-echoed spontaneously in a thousand forms in their minds.[1] For at that time new Christian writings of this description were not as yet considered at all, or were only here and there just coming to be considered, to belong to Sacred Scripture: and on that account ideas from them are found the more spontaneously, frequently, and forcibly re-echoed in this literature; a point which it is important for us in our day to note on various grounds.

It is true that of this stream of literature, which, according to all indications, once flowed in such an exceedingly plentiful measure, comparatively little has come down to us, and this little for the most part in a very imperfect condition. What a number of gospels which were then produced and largely read have perished! How early must many of the genuine epistles of an Ignatius and Polycarp, which undoubtedly once existed in addition to those still preserved,[2] have been lost! and the two epistles of Clement to the Corinthians, which we still possess, exist now in one manuscript only,[3] and in that one each of them more or less mutilated at the end! Very much of this literature has also come down to us in translations only and not in the original Greek. But some of these writings have been received into the New Testament, and if they were undoubtedly the best and much superior to the rest, and were, moreover, all of them written during the first half of this period, many others were a long time gladly read in the early churches, as we have seen in the case of a few. Indeed, not a few of these books exercised great influence at their very first appearance on the development of this entire period of the Church, so that we have already had to speak of them in describing the course of the common life of the Church. We must, however, give here a general review of the wide field as a whole, as far as this can be done with our present sources of information.

Epistles were from the first the most characteristic form of

[1] In the Epistle of Barnabas γέγραπται occurs only once, see *ante*, p. 115; we should have expected it more frequently in such writings as the so-called second Epistle of Clement, comp. cap. ii.; but a transition to such passages is formed by the expression 1 Tim. iv. 1, comp. *Jahrbb. der B. W.* iii. p. 253. But in those cases it is always passages from gospels that are meant.

[2] As to Ignatius' epistles, see *ante*, p. 217; it is plain from the language of Irenæus, *apud* Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* v. 20. 8, that many more of Polycarp's than have been preserved were once in circulation.

[3] [But see now *ante*, p. 205.]

Christian literature,[1] and Paul was the first great Christian author. But gospels were not on that account all later, but some were written before and during the labours of Paul. This latter branch of literature, indeed, by its intrinsic necessity was compelled at the very earliest period to put forth its utmost exertions; and before the destruction of Jerusalem, as well as immediately after that event, it had been so richly developed that the gospel of John soon afterwards placed upon it its crowning glory.[2] After this class of literature had attained its highest perfection in the gospel of John, it rapidly declined during the course of our period, as the materials which it had to use were already practically exhausted; and two special causes further contributed to its deeper decline. In the first place, the desire increased to represent in definite words the mysteries which may be conceived as behind the revealed life of Jesus, or its spiritual background, some of the greatest Evangelists having actually attempted to describe them. But as such a task is as tempting as it is difficult, if it shall be adequate to the great things to be represented, many who were ill qualified ventured in growing numbers to attempt it, and in so doing proceeded more and more capriciously in conception and narration. And then, as soon as the divisions in the Church which were described above came more decidedly to the front, and a number of separate churches were formed, each of them desired to see its view of Christianity based upon a special gospel of its own, and this also gave rise to no less arbitrary inventions. I have elsewhere discussed at length the various points of this subject.[3]

This historical part of Christian literature was soon extended so as to include the history of the apostles; and we have previously spoken of Luke's Acts of the Apostles, which belongs to our period.[4] It did not, it is true, remain throughout the course of the period the only book which treated of the deeds and teaching of one or more of the apostles or their disciples; on the contrary, gradually a number of *Acts*, or *Journeys*, or *Preachings*, or *Lives of the Apostles*, arose, and one of the first of these works, the *Preaching of Paul and Peter*, belongs undoubtedly to our period.[5] But like the Gospel literature this

[1] See vol. vii. pp. 320 sq.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 164 sq.

[3] In my essay on the origin and nature of the gospels, *Jahrbb. der B. W.* i.–iii. v. vi. [see now *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, 2nd ed. i. 1], with which must, however, be read the subsequent additions which I have made in various places.

[4] Vol. vii. pp. 23 sq., and *Jahrbb. der B. W.* ix. 49 sq. [and now the author's commentary on the *Apostelgeschichte*]. The earliest reference to the book is that of the *Test. Benj.* cap xi. (to be referred to immediately) in the words, *in the holy books* [Paul] *will be enrolled, both his work and his word*: this points to a historical work on Paul, and we know no other of that kind which would be so early as Luke's Acts of the Apostles.

[5] An important fragment of it, which

branch also soon degenerated under the influence of excessive licence, as each of the parties which then arose appealed to its own special apostles as well as to its own gospel, and the reminiscences of the apostles were reproduced in a party spirit. The straits and privations of the times, too, were great obstacles to the development of a historical literature, inasmuch as to make careful inquiries in detail with regard to all the deeds and fortunes of the missionaries of the faith since the first days of Christianity, and to commit the inquiries to writing, needed very different resources from those which were at the command of the Christians of those days, who were generally very poor.

On the other hand, that class of literature which was from the first most characteristically Christian and the most simple in its nature—epistolary literature—was continued little altered and with the utmost activity and efficiency throughout the whole of this period. No kind of literature was more necessary at every moment, and none flourished more than it. For, almost countless as the number of the separate churches became, there was as yet no firm outward bond which could represent their higher unity,[1] whilst they all alike felt the restraints and pressure of the suspicious Heathen governments. But there were all along many things in common for all of them; and, in whatever church a truer form of Christianity was specially flourishing, the desire in it grew proportionally strong to keep up a close fellowship in all matters with others in spite of the great obstacles. Thus underneath the oppressive forms of outward life all the most various means of active intercourse possible were made use of; epistles of all kinds and of every variety of contents circulated in large numbers; delegates went and came between certain or all churches; letters of introduction were exchanged without end; indeed, it is hardly possible to exaggerate the activity of such intercourse as now arose and was kept up under the difficulties of the time.[2] In very many of these epistles the most instructive questions for

has come down to us, has been referred to above (p. 182); and Heracleon, as early as the middle of the second century, used the book, according to Origen, *Comment. in Joh.* xiii. 17 (Opp. tom. iv. p. 226, ed. De la Rue), where a brief summary of the chief contents of the book is given; it is very noteworthy that Origen says he does not know whether it is *γνήσιον* or *νόθον* or *μικτόν*. The *Teaching of Peter*, which was likewise early mentioned, was probably the same book, from which we have fragments in the Syriac in Land's *Anecdota Syriaca*, i. p 19 *bis*.

[1] *Ante*, p. 222.

[2] As a fact this intercourse began in Paul's day, as we see from such passages as 2 Cor. viii. ix.; Acts xx. 4; Col. iv. 15, 16; its most active development during the second period may be seen best from the second and third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, cap. lix., the Epistles of Ignatius (see *ante*, p. 217) (comp. *Ep. ad Polyc.* capp. 7, 8; *ad Phil.* cap. 10; *ad Smyrn.* cap. xi.) and from Polycarp, *ad Phil.* capp. 9–14. Comp. *ante*, p. 235, and Rev. i. 11; ii. 1 sq.

all time, and not merely the most important ones for the moment, were dealt with; and as Christianity from the first laid so much stress on watchful and affectionate mutual agreement, admonition, and warning, epistolary literature became the most suitable means of public instruction by the pen. Accordingly there very soon arose imitative or artificial epistles in addition to simple ones, when an author who did not wish to write in his own name represented a deceased apostle as the writer of an epistle. Epistles also often took the form of brief essays,[1] which they became by very various stages, as we have seen more than once above; and it was precisely this specially Christian class of literature in which Heathen Christians could first of all take very active part.

In addition to the epistles above mentioned belonging to the later half of the period before us there is one which was early attached to the Epistle of Clement,[2] and must have been for a long time read with that epistle in the churches as a favourite didactic book. It was on that account called the Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians,[2] and it may really have been highly valued in the Corinthian church, and attached by it to its Epistle of Clement; but its language and style are that of another author, and its date is probably some decades later. As it has come down to us in only a very mutilated state at the end,[3] we are unable to ascertain clearly its purpose. As far as we can see, it was addressed as a general homily to all Christians, with an earnest admonition to remain faithful to Christianity,[4] notwithstanding that the certain coming of Christ in his glory continued to be postponed.[5] The

[1] As the Arabs call any brief or long essay sent out by itself a رسالة, and the Syrians ܐܓܪܬܐ, i.e. ἐπιστολή, comp. vol. v. p. 233, and Barhebræus in *Ass. Bibl. Vat.* iii. p. 224.

[2] It is found with the first Epistle of Clement in the *Cod. Alex.* That it was likewise addressed to the Corinthians we learn merely from *Can. Apost.* 85, comp. with Photius' *Bibl.* c. 113; and that it is not by Clement was observed by Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 38, comp. iii. 16; iv. 23. 11. [In the *Codex Constantinopolitanus*, see *ante*, p. 205, we have now the work probably complete, and the conjecture of Grabe and later critics of its being a homily is fully confirmed, see cap. 18.]

[3] [The additions in the *Cod. Const.* are mainly in cap. 10, and then of eight new chapters at the end.]

[4] Capp. 1–10.

[5] Capp. 11, 12, comp. *Jahrbb. der B. W.* vi. pp. 43 sq. [The additional chapters of the new MS. go on to exhort the hearers to penitence, that 'the name' may not be blasphemed (cap. 13), to do the will of God, keep the flesh in order that they may be of the church of life (cap. 14). The preacher thinks he has not exhorted to ἐγκράτεια in vain (cap. 15), reminds his hearers of the coming day of judgment, in language reminding us of 2 Pet. iii. 7–12 (cap. 16), exhorts them to repentance, and not to forget at home what they hear in the church from the presbyters, returns again to the coming judgment (capp. 17, 18), states the object of his 'homily'—their salvation and that of its reader by repentance (cap. 19), and finally exhorts them not to be disturbed at the prosperity of the wicked and the straits of the servants of God (cap. 20), comp. 2 Pet. ii. 8 sq.]

'epistle' has therefore a certain similarity with the Second Epistle of Peter,[1] but, unlike this book, is written in a very simple style, and evidently by a Heathen Christian. As one of the earliest evidences of the great enthusiasm which genuine Christianity enkindled amongst the noblest of the Heathen, it has a certain similarity also with the Epistle to Diognetus, only that, unlike the latter, it was addressed to 'brethren,' and not to Heathen.[2]

The Proverbs of Xystus.

But Christian literature reached during the course of this period a wider and freer range in the work of a Roman bishop, which we are now in a position to estimate more correctly. We refer to *Xystus*, or, as the Romans liked to Latinise the name, *Sixtus* (Sextus), the third successor of Clement as bishop of the Roman church, according to early tradition, and therefore the sixth in the line of Roman bishops, who was called to be the head of that church soon after Hadrian's accession, and remained in the office ten years.[3] As is the case with all the early Roman bishops except Clement, we now know no details of the life and history of this Xystus; but his book of *Select Sayings* (in Greek *Eclogæ*) supplies us with the plainest evidences of his being a very distinguished Christian thinker. The design of this book is to present, as established doctrine and as precepts for the various relations of life, a general Christian view of things in calm thought and in their universal bearing, combined with original Christian inwardness and enthusiasm. For the first time the Christian conscience comes before the whole world, in order to teach it generally and in detail its true duty, and to reduce the Christian ethical philosophy to brief and telling propositions. A Greek or Roman philosopher, who might vie with any of the philosophers of his day in knowledge, no less than in literary art and power, and who had found special delight in the more serious tendencies of Greek philosophy, has in this book become a Christian, and now, as

[1] [This similarity is still more obvious in the additional matter.]

[2] As to other fragments belonging to this period, see above, p. 173 note, and my *Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus*, pp. 282 sq.

[3] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii 3. 3, states simply that Clement was succeeded as Roman bishop by Evarestus, Alexander, and Xystus: the time of Xystus's occupancy of the office is given by Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 4. 5; in another book Irenæus appealed to him, as we see from Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* v. 24. 14. According to Eutychius's *Ann.* i. p. 351, he would have occupied the episcopal chair from the fourth to the fourteenth year of Trajan. His proverbs have now been published in the Syriac translation, recently discovered, by Lagarde in his *Analecta Syriaca*, pp. 1–31; I have discussed them further, especially with the view of showing that they are as early as the time of Trajan or Hadrian, in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1859, pp. 261–69; and much that was said in that place is not repeated here.

Christian philosophy has in his case given to that of the Greeks its true perfection, and led him to the true knowledge of human wisdom generally, he proclaims to all the world the substance of Christian wisdom and duty in brief clear sentences for its instruction and guidance. He accordingly takes the Old Testament book of Proverbs as his model, and, like the last of its authors, addresses his utterances to a *son*, or young man, whom he desires to instruct, though this son often becomes in his book every man who will give ear to Christian truth. He compresses everything that he has to say into the shortest possible sentences, so that his work becomes the first Christian Book of Proverbs; but as he does not, like a poet, bring his sayings within the limits of a definite verse-measure, his discourse soon expands to longer sentences and elaborate arguments. He does not, like a bishop or a monk of a later period, at once adopt as author Christian phrases and pious embellishments, as if a philosopher must at every step be making use of the name of Christ; on the contrary, he begins simply as a philosopher, and not a few sentences of the best Greek philosophers assume new life on his page; but inasmuch as Christianity alone forms the deepest foundation of the thoughts of his heart, it gradually and insensibly becomes all the more prominent, until in the end it shines forth in full splendour as the highest philosophy of life. Thus from the mouth of this Gentile Christian, with a lofty repose and assurance before unknown, there streams forth a philosophy and doctrine the subject-matter of which had never before been proclaimed in the Grecian world. In such a book a fixed progressive order of the sentences was not needed; at each pause in the wide region of Christian knowledge and duty, when reflection is at all indulged, it sparkles with a wealth of wise sentences, at times overflowing with most earnest admonitions. Not infrequently the same thought recurs, but only as if in order to obtain full expression and elucidation in all directions. A rigid division of the book is therefore hardly in accordance with its contents; yet we can see that it was intended to fall into three general sections, the first of which takes as its basis God and the Divine wisdom; the second, Man; the third, Christ: the second towards the end beginning to allude more directly to Christian truth. Unfortunately the third section has come down to us only in a mutilated state at the end.

As thus the character of the work shows that it belongs to this period of the first full entrance of Christianity into the world, the manner in which it uses the written sources of

Christian doctrine supports the conclusion. It takes especially the Sermon on the Mount and the similar passages of the gospels as its basis; these utterances and sentences of Christ himself, as they had long been read in the earlier gospels, were re-echoed most distinctly in the mind of our Xystus, making him a true Christian and enthusiastic teacher of Christians, and resounded now in a hundred new tones and forms from his soul as the most blessed certainty. Next to those utterances it is less the words of Paul's epistles which relive on his page, although in his view faith with knowledge or wisdom occupied the highest place; and he connects these two celestial influences most closely; in this smaller attention to the epistles of Paul, Xystus agrees with so many of the best Christians of those early days. But, on the one hand, it is especially the ideas and language of the Epistle of James which are most familiar to him, and with James he delights especially to speak of the perfect *Law of God* and of true Christian works. On the other hand, it is no less the writings of the Apostle John which he has made most fully his own, and the meaning and spirit of which stream forth from him again most forcibly—often in the same words.[1] This may serve as a proof of the early and ready union and agreement of the fundamental utterances of these two apparently opposite apostles in the true Christian spirit itself. But Xystus nowhere appeals to names or New Testament books as if they already belonged to the Scriptures:[2] a point in which he still resembles completely the earliest Christian authors.[3] Against the numerous false doctrines which were then so widely spread in the Church our author often utters warnings without more definitely denominating them by Gnostic names.[4] He insists earnestly on all Christian duties, and speaks of kinds of food, of marriage,[5] and similar matters, quite in the spirit of Paul, without appealing to his words. He recognises the high place of martyrdom, as above,[6] but is not of those who demand it of every Christian; on the contrary, strictly as he requires truth and truthfulness every-

[1] From p. 4. 12 onwards so many words and ideas are re-echoed from the First Epistle of John that in this also we have a confirmation of what I proved in the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* v. 185 sq., namely, that the more close our acquaintance with the oldest writings of the second century becomes, the more certainly we meet in them again the actual use of the genuine writings of the Apostle John.

[2] Although he clearly points to the Scripture in its connection with the Logos, p. 26. 15, comp. 24. 25 sq.

[3] *Ante*, p. 243.

[4] E.g. p. 5. 5, 6; 19. 18 sq. On the other hand, *the Wise*, as those having a knowledge of the Scripture, and as being otherwise endowed with unusual insight, he ranks with the Chief (Bishop), e.g. p. 18. 25, 26; 19. 6 sq.; 23. 25, 26.

[5] p. 8. 23 sq.; 18. 27 sq.

[6] *Ante*, pp. 231 sq.

where, as the highest Christian duty, he permits the use of prevarication and of poison if they are the only means of escape from the fatal plots of enraged non-Christians.[1] This is one of the first indications of the bad effects in the end of the long and severe persecutions under Trajan. Another indication of this is the repeated and strong warnings rather not to speak at all of the Christian mysteries when it might be dangerous to do so.[2]

These earliest, and at the same time most admirable Christian sentences, or proverbs, were undoubtedly very much read in those first centuries,[3] but they were also greatly abbreviated, transposed, and reconstructed, new collections of sentences being frequently made from the original work. In these later transformations of them, in which their original force and flavour were often so much weakened as to make them by abbreviation particularly unrecognisable and unintelligible, their excellence and worth might be gradually undervalued;[4] and in the Latin collection taken from them, which is the only Latin version preserved, this injurious abbreviation has been made. But, as we now have the original sentences well preserved in an ancient Syriac translation, though greatly mutilated towards the end, it is only just that we should seek to restore to them their true value and antiquity.

The Christian Prophetic Books.

A Christian prophetic book, of a very perfect kind, and the best which, as imbued with the Christian spirit, could at the time be produced, had appeared before the destruction of Jerusalem, written by a certain John, but not the apostle.[5]

[1] p. 3. 29, 30; 16. 17 sq. In their proper connection these sentences have nothing un-Christian in them.

[2] p. 7. 3. sq.; 23. 20 sq.; 27. 29: this has nothing in common with the later *disciplina arcani*; nor with the views in Clement's *Hom.* 17. 6; 18. 9–12; 19. 20; 20. 8, *diamartyria*, cap. v., which accord with those of the school of the Elcesaites, *ante*, p. 124.

[3] Which appears especially from Origen's reference *Contra Cels.* viii. 30 and in his *Comment. in Matt.* xv. 3 (ed. De la Rue, tom. iii. p. 654); and a comparatively very large number of MSS. of the Syriac translation (seven, namely) have been now discovered. It should also be remembered that, to judge from the language, this Syriac translation must be very ancient.

[4] The errors of earlier ecclesiastical historians as to these *Gnomæ* may be easily explained: it was thought that a good deal had been accomplished when they were ascribed to the Roman bishop Xystus II., who held office about 258 A.D.; but in that case Origen could not have referred to them; and if Xystus II. had been an author neither Eusebius in his *Ecc. Hist.* nor Jerome in his *De Script. Eccles.* would have forgotten to mention the fact. We may see from Assemani, *Bibl. Vat.* i. p. 429 how little the later Syrians were able to form a correct notion as to the home and age of the work [Comp. now on these *Sententiæ*, or *Gnomæ* of Σέξτιος, the edition of Gildemeister, *Sexti sententiarum recensiones latinam græcam syriacas conjunctim exhibuit, Bonnæ ad Rhen.* 1873.]

[5] See vol. vii. pp. 527 sq.

Old Testament prophecy, in the favourite literary form which it had gradually assumed in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era, had been thus revived under the name of the true author in a thoroughly Christian spirit, and in a great and noble work. But it appeared only too soon that the true age of the great prophets of Israel had long been past and could not be restored even by the fresh forces of Christianity, since Christianity is, on the contrary, the consummation of all that the prophets had once striven for, and that on that account the incomplete and partial development of the prophetic office in action and speech, which was once needful, must gradually cease. Whatever, therefore, of a similar character still appeared after the extraordinary period just before the destruction of Jerusalem, it reverted to the form of a simple imitation of the prophetic models supplied in the Old Testament, and was published also only under the assumed names of greater men. Thus in our period an *Apocalypse of Peter* must have been published and much read;[1] it has, however, perished too completely to allow us to form a precise idea of its contents.

But if it was desired to present a wide general view of the history of the world from the new Christian standpoint, and to proceed from that basis to true Christian admonitions, no more suitable means offered than the art of introducing as speakers certain saints and heroes from hoar antiquity, that art having been developed to a high degree of perfection in the Ancient Community. From the time of the Book of Enoch[2] it had been the custom to bring forward the sacred figures of the Patriarchal age as acting and speaking, in order the more impressively to call up, as seen by them from their exaltation, all the unfoldings of time, and by their sacred lips to enunciate the more forcibly all the admonitions which the contemporaries needed to hear; but this form of presenting truth had in the meantime been further facilitated, inasmuch as the ideas to be presented were clothed simply in the form of discourses of holy men of antiquity, or of Divine announcements to them, as the Book of Jubilees shows.[3] The model of the latter and similar works, which were then undoubtedly widely read, was in our period followed[4] by a Christian author, who sprung from the

[1] See below in the section on the Canon. A few sentences from it have been preserved in the *Eclogæ ex Propheticis*, § 41 sq. (at the end of Potter's ed. of Clem. Alex.) [See Hilgenfeld's *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem*, iv. pp. 74 sq.] As to the much later Apocalypse of Paul, see *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1866, pp. 1088 sq.; on the Apocalypse of Clement, as disciple of Peter, see *ante*, p. 229.

[2] Vol. v. pp. 345 sq.

[3] Vol. i. p. 201.

[4] Dillmann has shown in the *Jahrbb.*

Ancient Community, in a new and very extensive work, in which, after the manner of the ancient swan-song of Jacob, Gen. xlix., he made each of the twelve sons of Jacob address before his death admonitions and prophetic words to his sons, and which has therefore received the name of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.*[1] We are justified in supposing that this work, which has come down to us entire, was published about 90–110 A.D., as on the one hand it refers to the second destruction of Jerusalem as past,[2] and on the other shows no trace at all of the final Judean wars and the mortal alienation between the Christians and the Judeans to which they gave rise.[3] It belongs to the tranquil interval between the previous and the now pending Judean wars, when an earnest and believing Christian, who belonged by birth to the Ancient Community, looked, with somewhat of the same zealous affection as Paul had shown in his day, upon that community, and resolved once more to make the utmost effort to lead it to Christ; indeed, the characteristic feature of the work is the childlike and sincere affection with which this author still stands as mediator between the two communities, that by this literary device and the force of Christian eloquence he may influence as far as possible the Ancient Community.

It is not possible to conceive a more sincere or a more zealous Christian at this period than our author was: all the ideas and desires to which he here gives utterance breathe a genuine Christian spirit. It is true on purely ethical questions he retains the language of the Old Testament, and everywhere, with the Epistle of James, which was evidently before his eyes as a model, he speaks especially of the Law of God,[4] which, however, means to him the revealed will of God,[5] and which he

der B. W. pp. 90 sq., that the Book of Jubilees is older than the *Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs.*

[1] See vol. i. p. 199. [To this reference to the editions of the Testaments we can now add, *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum ad fidem Codicis Cantabrigiensis edita: accedunt Lectiones Cod. Oxoniensis*, by Robert Sinker, Cambridge, 1869, and *Appendix* (1879) *containing a Collation of the Roman and Patmos MSS.*]

[2] Such words as Levi, capp. 10, 15, both from their intrinsic meaning and their place in this book, as well as from still plainer indications such as occur Nepth. cap. 4, can only refer to the second destruction.

[3] It is important to observe this point in fixing the age of this book; but it will appear below that its very design renders it impossible that it should have been written after the final Judean wars.

[4] Levi, capp. 13, 16, 19; Jud. capp. 18, 26; Issach. cap. 5; Zab. cap. 10; Dan. cap. 6; Nepth. cap. 8; Gad. cap. 1; Ass. capp. 2, 6; Jos. cap. 11; Ben. cap. 10. As regards language, comp. e.g. *συλλαβοῦσα*, Reub. cap. 3; Ben. cap. 7 from James 1. 15.

[5] According to Dan. cap. 6; Nepth. cap. 3. Fasting is justified only when voluntary, Jos. cap. 3; the laws regarding food and circumcision are never mentioned. Even when Christ is called the renewer of the Law, Levi, cap. 16, this must be understood in the Christian sense only.

therefore never understands in the limited sense of a Judean, or even of an Ebionite. But at the same time Paul is, in his estimation, not only higher than all the other apostles on account of his invaluable Christian services,[1] but he is often quite in accord with him in point of language, particularly when he speaks against the perversities of the Judeans;[2] and of Christ himself he speaks, as far as he could delineate his features in discourses with a prophetic garb, with the elevation of a Paul or a John, as only one of the most believing Christians of his day could speak.[3] He particularly acknowledges the abominable and murderous action of the hierarchical princes of Israel against Christ, by which the breach between the Old and the New Community became irremediable.[4] At the same time, if we give due heed to the inmost feeling of our author, as it had developed itself in him in accordance with his exceptional personal position, and as it finally finds expression in his book, it is impossible to avoid seeing not only that he was himself a teacher of the Law of highest repute, and of Levitical or higher descent,[5] but also that as a Christian he still retained the special hopes which had from ancient times been connected with the tribe of Levi, and in support of which he could appeal to so many passages of the Old Testament, especially as he nowhere affects or recommends the allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament. In conformity with such passages Levi and Judah are in his view the two principal tribes of Israel, and the firmest pillars of the kingdom of God on the earth; a view which he seeks to confirm as a Christian by special reference to the human descent of Christ;[6] without Levi he cannot conceive a sacred community, not even the Christian Church;[7] and though Jerusalem had to be twice destroyed,

[1] See vol. vi. p. 471; for nothing but folly can maintain that Ben. cap. 11 is a later addition to the work.

[2] E.g. the fearful sentence, ἔφθασε, etc. 1 Thess. ii. 16, is repeated, only somewhat more distinctly, Levi, cap. 6 *ad fin.* [On the passages of the New Testament referred to in the work, see the very full index at the end of Sinker's edition.]

[3] Expressions like τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου, Levi, cap. 14; σωτήρ, Levi, capp. 10, 14, Dan. cap. 6, comp. *ante*, p. 191; μονογενής, Ben. cap. 9, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας μαρτυρεῖ, Juda, cap. 20, point plainly to John, and the frequent way of speaking of God as appearing in human flesh is in this work more frequent than in any book of the New Testament. It cannot create surprise that at the same time Christ is called the highest angel, i.e. intercessor, and mediator, Dan. cap. 6, and the highest prophet, Levi, cap. 8 [see on this passage Sinker, p. 90], and these designations are met with elsewhere in those times.

[4] To which there is plain allusion, Levi, capp. 4, 10, 14, 15, 16, and elsewhere.

[5] The manner and nature of the injunction, Levi, cap. 13, are too plain to be misunderstood.

[6] In order to perceive the full meaning of the author in this respect we must connect such utterances as the following, Reub. cap. 6; Sim. capp. 5–7; Levi, cap. 4; Juda, capp. 21, 22, 24; Zab. cap. 9; Dan, capp 1, 5; Nepht. capp. 5, 6, 8; Gad, cap. 8; Jos. cap. 19, Ben. cap. 9, comp. vol. vi. p. 186.

[7] See utterances like Levi, cap. 8, Juda, capp. 21, 22; in the latter pas-

and the entire nation of the ancient true religion to be punished beyond measure for its apostasy from that religion and its rejection of Christ, it appears to him that Israel itself cannot in its essential nature wholly perish.[1] Christ, it is true, comes as the light of the world, and to lead all nations to eternal salvation;[2] but the dispersion of Israel is nevertheless a great calamity in the view of our author, and he anticipates, in conformity with certain passages of the Old Testament, a return of Israel from it;[3] and though he does not mention the Romans by name as the chief enemy, he alludes to them plainly enough for intelligent readers.[4] We see from this, therefore, most plainly that not a few of the best and most sincere members of the Ancient Community entered the New Community, and remained steadily faithful to it, partly because they cherished the hope that many of the deepest and fondest national expectations of the Ancient Community might after its terrible devastation be at all events fulfilled in the new one; and we see also that on this account it required, as a Divine necessity, a further final shock to and destruction of all the earthly hopes of the Ancient Community in order to extirpate in the hearts of even some of the most believing and faithful Christians reliance upon them in any form whatever.

But as our Levitical Christian, with a view of once more addressing, in this more tranquil interval, a final earnest admonition to the remnant of his fellow-countrymen, makes the utmost effort possible to literary art, he puts into the mouth of each of the twelve patriarchs, in his last moments, when, on the confines of eternity, his spirit glances into all times, past and future, utterances in which the truly Christian meaning pervades every thought, and the words of each speaker simply supplement and explain those of his predecessor, until at last a single and more forcible admonition is the outcome of the words of all. The whole of the twelve were regarded as having died the death of the righteous, but as only very few of them, according to sacred tradition, had in their youth lived spotless

sage, cap. 21, the text is very corrupt, and must be restored somewhat as follows: Ἰσραήλ. Σὺ δὲ ἔσῃ βασιλεὺς Ἰακώβ. ὁ δὲ κόσμος ὡς ἡ θάλασσα, so that afterwards ἐν σοί must be omitted. [The Patmos MS. reads ἐμὲ δὲ βασιλεύειν ἐν Ἰακὼβ καὶ εἶναι ἐν αὐτοῖς ὡς ἐν θ. Sinker, *Appendix*, p. 68.]

[1] Comp. Levi, capp. 5, 15; Juda, cap. 17; Nepht. capp. 6, 8; Zab. cap. 9; Dan. cap. 6; Ass. cap. 7; Ben. cap. 10.

[2] Levi, capp. 4, 8, 14; Juda, cap. 24; Dan. cap. 6; Nepht. cap. 4; Ben. capp. 3, 10, 11.

[3] See, e.g. Nepht. capp. 4, 6; Levi, capp. 14–18.

[4] On the monster, which represents antichrist, Nepht. cap. 5, appear also the wings of the *eagle*, comp. *ante*, p. 54; and what is said of Esau as the enemy of Juda, Juda, cap. 9; Gad, cap. 7; Ben. cap. 10, is intended to apply to Rome likewise.

lives, the author had an excellent opportunity, in speaking of the sincere repentance of these national ancestors, to describe that which every surviving descendant of the patriarchs must still have if he would not miss true salvation. Accordingly, it is Joseph particularly, as the innocent lamb betrayed by the rest, over whose mortal persecution and rejection the brothers saved by him now show bitter repentance, who becomes the true type of Christ; while the repentance of the eleven patriarchs ought to be the example for all the Judeans then living.[1] As the author, however, although he used later books on the history of Jacob and his sons,[2] found to his hand few historical details regarding the personal peculiarities of each of the twelve patriarchs, it was not at all easy for him to make each of them speak in a specially characteristic way, and his whole book might easily, in consequence of its plan, become very monotonous; nor can we say that it is by the vigour and elevation of its ideas and language that this work is distinguished in the Christian literature of the time: yet the author skilfully selects for each speaker some special frame of mind and some uncommon experience of his life as the starting-point of his utterances, so that pure repetitions are not frequent. According to the ultimate Christian purpose of the work, each of the twelve discourses into which the book is divided was intended, above all, to be of a prophetic character; but the higher Christian spirit is so predominant in it that everywhere involuntarily simple and forcible Christian exhortation is poured forth at great length, and the whole book, in spite of its extremely different plan, becomes an attempt to expound fully the contents of the new Christian ethical system, rivalling in this respect the Proverbs of Xystus.[3] The tendency to exhortation and instruction sometimes scorns the limitations of the immediate discourse.[4] Prophetic matter, and, indeed, an attempt, after the manner of the Book of Enoch, to present a summary view of history previous to Christ in its chief epochs, could not be lost sight of; but the attempt is not very satisfactorily executed,[5] as if the end of all such artificial prophetic

[1] As we see from Jos. cap. 19; Ben. cap. 3.

[2] See vol. i. p. 380.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 247 sq.

[4] As when *thou* suddenly breaks in, Gad, cap. 7; Juda, cap. 21, where, however, as we have seen, *ante*, p. 254, the text is corrupt.

[5] It is the endeavour, Levi, capp. 17, 18, comp. cap. 16, to arrange all the ages from Moses to Christ in seventy divine hebdomads, or in seven jubilees of forty-nine years each, so that each jubilee is distinguished by a priest of its own, and Christ appears as the eighth. According to cap. 16, he had in this division Enoch's prophecy concerning the seventy wicked shepherds in his mind (see my *Abhandlung über das B. Henokh*, p. 90 sq.), but he works it out in an obscure way, as, indeed, from the nature of the division, he could not avoid doing. Before the

books, as not quite suitable to the Christian spirit, were to be reached in this book.

Finally, the author of this work likes to reduce everything to sacred numbers, in conformity with the plan and spirit of such prophetic books.[1] But he probably wrote in Greek, as living amongst the Gentiles, for the Hebrew idioms, which are very marked in some parts of his sentences, may be readily explained from the Hellenistic spirit and the endeavour to imitate the language of the ancient heroes of Israel.

But the endeavour to present exhaustively such ideas of the eternal significance and mysterious exaltation of Christ's appearing, when once they had been thus broached, might take the form of introducing one of the greatest of the Old Testament prophets as prophetically anticipating and expounding them. In such a case the thought would be confined to the celestial aspect of Christ's coming, and this great subject might be worked out with the deepest emotion and inexpressible joy. But there was none of the prophets of the Old Testament who would naturally appear so suitable for this purpose as the regal prophet Isaiah, in whose book all the highest Messianic truths were found so clearly presented that it was easy to suppose that in the exalted moments of his prophetic life and ecstasy he saw mysteriously somewhat more than his book describes. Thus originated the little book, the 'Ascension of Isaiah,'[2]

first jubilee Moses appears, with the fifth the first dispersion; but the whole scheme is from the first obscure.

[1] E.g. seven or eight spirits of error and creation Reub. capp. 2, 3, Ben. cap. 7; seven heavens, Levi, capp. 2, 3; seven priestly adornments, and seven bearers of them, Levi, cap. 8; antichrist also consists of seven nations, Nepht. cap. 5. Amongst these seven nations the Romans are not expressly mentioned, but are undoubtedly included; but to fill up the number seven Γελαιαῖοι [Sinker, Γελαχαῖοι, Χελκαῖοι, Codex *R.* omits, and *P.* has Γεθγέοι] are counted amongst them, and are undoubtedly intended to answer to the חֲלָח, vol. iv. p. 165; and as the last of the seven are Syrians this list is probably taken from an earlier book. We have also 4 and 3 as sacred numbers; and in the use of them much is almost too briefly hinted at. Thus Levi's seed is to be threefold, cap. 8, namely, the *first* of the believers must be Moses, who, according to Ex. iii., believed before any of his people, in accordance with Paul's doctrine of faith; the *second*, the priest, is Aaron; the *third*, with a new name, as king rising out of Juda, is Christ, in the same way as the priest's daughter Maria is called a virgin from Juda, in consequence of the intermarriage of the tribes, according to Jos. xix.

[2] In its original form this work contained only what now appears in the Ethiopic translation as vi. 1–xi. 1. 23–40. It was plain at once from internal indications that these portions only formed the original work, but it is satisfactory that the evidence of the ancient Latin translation of the book published by Gieseler in 1832 comes in to make the true state of the matter still more obvious. We must keep to this ancient Latin translation, which is probably from the second century, if we desire to ascertain accurately the character of the original work, although some things belonging to it have been preserved better in the Ethiopic translation. [Since 1868 Dillmann has published the entire work, *Ascensio Isaiæ, Æthiopice et Latine, cum proleg. et annot.* Lips. 1877. Dillmann thinks it probable that the *Christian Ascensio* or *Visio*, ch. vi. 1–xi. 1, 23–40, was written before the development of the separate Gnostic systems, and probably in the first decades of the second century. See his art. *Pseu-*

which, of its kind, is one of the most delicate and beautiful little productions conceivable. In the twentieth year of Hezekiah's reign, according to it, Isaiah came from Golgotha, the place destined to become so mysteriously important, near Jerusalem, where he resided,[1] to Hezekiah, in his palace, to a public court; but while he was before the king engaged in a most animated conversation on faith and righteousness, he suddenly sank into a profound death-like sleep. But his spirit had only in the meantime, as it were, separated from his body and gone forth into the most mysterious heights of all the heavens. There conducted by the angel of prophecy, he beheld in the seventh heaven Christ himself surrounded by all the heavenly host. Thence he descended with Christ himself, and thus perceived at once how the purely celestial Christ could pass through all the heavens and stoop to the earth; he beheld how Christ would some time take a human form on the earth, and at the end of his terrestrial stay ascend again to heaven; and during all these visions he heard the most unutterable words and explanations. When he then came to himself he told to Hezekiah and the whole royal audience what he had seen and heard; and our author has thus invented the simplest means to fill with the Christian spirit the conceptions of the mysteries of the heavens and the spirit-world in which the Essenes and other members of the ancient true religion were absorbed even in pre-Christian times; and he obtained, above all, the means of describing, as clearly as human language admitted, the highest Christian mystery of the incarnation of the eternal Christ. The Book of Enoch especially, with its descriptions of the celestial world and of the Messiah, was before his mind, so that he repeats some things from it verbatim,[2] whilst the Apocalypse of the New Testament in other respects serves him as a model.[3] The best thing in this description of the Ascension of Christ rather than of Isaiah was that it presented such a transcendent subject in a tolerably simple and clear way.

This elegant little work both shows much more literary art and is also later than the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs,

epigraphen des A. T. in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, 2nd ed.]

[1] The ancient Latin translation has, vi. 4, the reading Golgatha, which is undoubtedly better than Galilee, which no ancient writer could introduce into Isaiah's life.

[2] E.g. when he calls the Messiah simply *the Beloved* and the *Elect One* (viii. 7); the first of these two names has been retained in the two later authors of other parts of the composite book, i. 7, 13; iii. 13, 17; iv. 18: these short names are first met with in the Book of Enoch.

[3] The ideas and utterances, vii. 21–23; viii. 4, 5; ix. 31 are from Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 8, 9; σὺ οἶδας or σὺ γινώσκεις in the passage ix. 33–36 after the more complete form in Epiphan. *Hær.* lvii. 3 is from Rev. vii. 14; and several other things of this kind might be quoted.

with which it has similarity in the description of celestial visions;[1] but we find no reason to place it much later, and it may have been written during the first decades of the second century.[2] It was also undoubtedly early very much read, as we may plainly see from the imitation and the extensions which it received. For a somewhat later Christian conceived the idea of representing the entire history of Christ's life on the earth and that of his Church down to his own time in the form of a vision, which Isaiah likewise described to Hezekiah as he had received it. This *vision* of Isaiah had the entirely different purpose of censuring certain vices into which the Church in the neighbourhood of the author had then fallen, and in that respect resembles the Pastor of Hermas; but the story was thrown into the simple prophetic form, and the figures and style were quite different.[3]

A later Christian again sought subsequently to combine these two perfectly different works in one as well as he was able. At the beginning he added the historical traditions as to the relation of Isaiah to Hezekiah's son, Manasseh, and as to his martyrdom, so that the whole book in this form—at all events so far as the first half of it was concerned—could be called Isaiah's *Martyrdom*. The last author made use undoubtedly of an earlier Judean book, in which the legend of the death of Isaiah was told in a similar form;[4] but his way of

[1] Comp. Levi, capp. 2, 3.

[2] Neither the fact that the ἀναβατικὸν Ησαΐου, Epiphan. *Hær.* xl. 2; lxvii. 3 was used by the Archontics and Hieracites as a favourite book, nor that Valentinians fixed, as in this work, cap. ix., 6 (comp. xi. 21), the time between the resurrection and ascension of Christ as a year and a half, proves that the author had been a Valentinian. There is more reason to suppose that the Valentinians found our work in existence and made it the basis of many of their propositions.

[3] Of this *Vision* of Isaiah there has been preserved, xi. 2–22; iii. 13–iv. 22: for the last author perceived clearly that he could not very well insert the whole at the passage xi. 2 sq., since it would there have interrupted too greatly the connection of the Ascension; so he inserted the rest at iii. 13, restoring the connection as well as he was able in both places. Moreover, what the oldest author desired to indicate regarding the history of Christ he has already introduced, ix. 12–18. We may distinguish the three authors also by the fact that the earliest of them designated Satan by the simplest name (as may be seen from vii. 9, 12; ix. 14; x. 12; xi. 23 with a comparison of the ancient Latin translation), whilst the second likes to give him the more elaborate name of Sammaël, or (as in the *Test. XII. Patr.*) Belial, and the third adds the new name Malkira. The internal condition of the Church which this second author touches upon is, however, scarcely worse than that implied in the epistle of Clement and the Pastor of Hermas.

[4] The passages i. 1–iii. 12; v. 1–16; xi. 41–43 are from the third and last author. It is obvious that the legend of the sawing asunder of Isaiah had been already given in an earlier Judean book, and Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* cap. 120, as well as the author of *Constit. Apost.* vi. 16. 2, refers probably to that earlier book; but it ought not to be denied that our present book was in existence in the second century, and is the one intended by Tertullian and Origen. Our present book is found not only in the Æthiopic translation, but also in a second early Latin translation of which Mai published some fragments in his *Nova Coll. Scriptt. Vet.* ii. p. 238 sq. (1828).

telling the story is not very skilful. And in spite of these later additions the favourite name for the work continued to be the Ascension of Isaiah.

III.

THE FINAL COMPLETE OVERTHROW OF THE ANCIENT NATION.

1. *The Situation after the Fall of the Flavians.*

Whilst the New Community, notwithstanding all the obstacles and persecutions of the time, advances to meet its future development with growing patience under all frivolous provocations, and with steady faithfulness to its own truth and eternal hopes; on the other hand, the Ancient Community, already broken down internally and trodden down from without, resigns itself gradually more and more to passions and commotions, or indeed to the most sanguinary conflicts, which could only hasten its final ruin and seal it for all time. That result, it is true, was inevitable, if the remnant of the Ancient Community refused to truly learn the lessons of the last punishment of its false position and aims generally, and determined to adhere essentially to its utterly erroneous course. Most of that remnant did this [1] when they perpetually waited for more favourable circumstances, in which they might break through the oppressive obstacles of the time, and once more establish and finally complete the former rule of the Hagiocracy in the Holy Land. If such favourable times came, they were necessarily the more dangerous to them on account of the ancient and recent prophecies of the impossibility of the ruin of Israel, according to their interpretations of them; or on account of the indestructible nucleus of advantages which this ancient sacred Community supposed with good reason it possessed before the Gentiles; or on account of the old and accumulated hatred of the existing empire of the world, to which was now added the new hatred of the Christians.

Such a favourable period arrived with the overthrow of the Flavians, and it became at once the critical turning-point in the course of the development of matters in these last days. This overthrow, which took place so suddenly and alarmingly,

[A Greek text, which is a later reproduction of the whole book, has been published by Gebhardt in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1878.] In how far the Persian *Ardâi-Virâf-Nâme* is connected with this book, or rather uses it, must be settled elsewhere.

[1] *Ante*, pp. 27 sq.

gave to all the oppressed and troubled of the time a welcome freedom, and for the members of the ancient nation must have brought specially good omens. All the disastrous ruin which had assailed it since Nero's last days seemed to have come upon it through the Flavian dynasty alone; and the overthrow of the dynasty, which had been long earnestly prayed for by the most zealous members of the nation, appeared to have overtaken it in fulfilment of the righteous judgments of Heaven. It is true a complete fulfilment of the Messianic hope by no means followed immediately upon Domitian's fall, as had been expected by the revived prophecy;[1] but the fact that this prophecy had now at all events met with a surprising commencement of its fulfilment must have powerfully helped to quicken the enthusiasm of the time. And although Nerva left in force the fundamental laws of Vespasian regarding the Judeans, he abolished at once the most invidious regulations which Domitian had at last so much intensified, and during his reign they were not renewed.[2] He also abolished particularly the insulting manner of levying the tax to Jupiter which Domitian had ordered;[3] and this especially was honoured as a boon with public thanks by the Judeans in Italy in the first instance.[4] Throughout the whole extent of the Roman empire the Judeans were thus able to breathe more freely, and to look forward to the future in a joyous and expectant mood. And Trajan, although he drew the reins of his government tighter than Nerva, made no change at first in this respect; and thus for the space of a decade the Judeans were left more in peace and allowed to recover themselves.

But in this period of comparatively more undisturbed life, which might have been to them the commencement of real improvement, the gloomy resentment which had accumulated too much in the hearts of most of the remnant of the nation woke up the more irrepressibly against the restrictive influences of the time. It was directed in the first instance against the few Judeans who had in the thirty years previously connected

[1] *Ante*, pp. 53 sq.

[2] As Cassius Dio, *Hist.* lxviii. 1, says expressly.

[3] *Ante*, p. 79.

[4] Coins were struck with Nerva's bust and on the reverse a palm tree, as the symbol of Judæa, and the inscription *Fisci Judaici calumnia sublata*; see Eckhel's *Doctr. Numorum* II. vol. vi. p. 404 sq. The tax itself was continued as commanded by Vespasian: it was only the insulting manner in which it was levied that was abolished. In order to escape the tax many permitted an artificial foreskin to grow; for about this time we hear a good deal again of the ἐπισπασμός as well as of מְשׁוּכִים *recutiti* (G. Jebamôth 72 *a*, Mart. *Epigr.* vii. 30. 5), but from an entirely different cause than in previous times, vol. v. pp. 269, 294.

themselves with the Romans, as we saw in the instance of Josephus.[1] It was directed with equal violence, or rather with much greater bitterness, against the Christians, especially against those who had seceded from Judeanism, who were regarded as simple traitors to the true religion; and it was now that the alienation from Christianity, and indeed the desire to persecute it, increased more and more.[2] If thus in the heart of the Ancient Community hostility to everything which had become, as it supposed, unfaithful to it flamed up afresh, and if it obtained new undoubted victories in this direction, where fewest obstacles could be put in its way, the same hostility must consistently be soon directed with fresh violence against the secular governments whenever events should, perhaps by accident, present any unusual inducement. Fear of the Roman omnipotence and merciless severity which had been impressed upon the previous generation, and had so terribly humbled it, grew less in the younger generation of this apparently more favourable time, and everything promised new open struggles.

Rabbi Akîba.

But the internal constitution of Judeanism and its various communities at that time permitted no truly religious movement or secular aim to become powerful in it which was not set on foot and promoted by the Rabbis;[3] and the smouldering fire of hostility to the Heathen and the Christians which existed amongst these dispersed communities of Judeans would never have broken out into an open flame if the feeling and the teaching of the Rabbis had remained all along as cautious and peaceable as they were in the decades immediately after the fall of Jerusalem.[4] But in this respect a great change now took place. The spirit of stubborn opposition and open revolt spread amongst the Rabbis themselves in these decades after the overthrow of the Flavians, and reduced Gamaliel and other moderate teachers like him[5] more and more to silence; indeed, this spirit must have completely overthrown the institution of a new form of the Sanhedrin which we met with above,[6] as some Rabbis, in their wild enthusiasm, with its provocations to passionate and open rebellion, refused to submit to its regulations, and sought to pledge the excited masses to obey their own separate Councils. We are unable to follow in detail these internal contentions of the schools, which were undoubtedly

[1] *Ante*, p. 74. [2] *Ante*, p. 44. [3] *Ante*, pp. 27 sq. [4] *Ante*, p. 77.
[5] *Ante*, pp. 33 sq. [6] *Ante*, p. 34.

very violent; the memory of them was immediately lost through the calamitous issue of the struggles of war; but the issue shows only too plainly that a great change was gradually taking place, and that the active participation of the Rabbis became the real soul of the following final struggle with the Roman Government. Above all, it was one Rabbi of unusual force, decision, and clearness of mind who was conscious of the power once more to play a part in determining the course of history, and who was then strong enough to hold out to the very last in the raging of its hottest fire. This man was *Akîba ben-Joseph*, whom we may call in many respects the last hero of the hopelessly perishing nation of Israel, and who was destined even in death to behold the last gleams of the political power of this community.

As Akîba[1] had been throughout his long life a very distinguished and exceedingly active teacher of the Law, and had at last at a very advanced age sealed the purpose and the confession of his whole life by equally extraordinary faithfulness in the most painful martyr's death, later generations have a great deal to say about him. Moreover, he had not, like the learned Zealots, under whose armed and sanguinary hands Jerusalem had fallen, himself resorted to the use of arms, and could in so far be regarded by the later Rabbis as the model of a true teacher; and they therefore confine themselves mainly to his labours and views as a scholar, although, on account of their boldness, his views were rather admired than followed. Yet, with regard to the course of his earlier life, and also of his long subsequent career, down to the moment when it is at last lost in the wide stream of the history of the world, it is only either legendary or very disconnected accounts that have been preserved, from which it is impossible to form a clear and connected idea of his history. It is certain that, though he witnessed the close of this period of almost seventy years, down to the end of the last great war, he had once seen Jerusalem in all its glory, and could tell much from his personal recollection of the sacred customs then observed.[2] It is equally certain that though he was born poor, and, indeed, according to one tradition, was of Heathen descent, subsequently, either by marriage or the immense number of his grateful pupils, he was very rich, but spent his wealth in the great cause of the faith of his heart.[3] For Judeanism alone was the thing most sacred to his

[1] See also *ante*, p. 42.

[2] *M.* Joma, vii. 3; Sukkah, iii. 9; Edujoth, ii. 1: elsewhere it is rather merely learned judgments of his that are quoted.

[3] He was at first a shepherd to one of

heart,[1] and to it he devoted himself with all the courageous force of his knowledge, and the fire of his fervid and zealous affection.

Nothing is more characteristic of the bent of his mind than that he everywhere sought for firm principles and general laws [2] and applied them in his learned labours with the greatest steadiness and consistency.[3] His mind loved close inquiry and clear system: the vast disorganised mass of views which had been traditional in the Schools of the Law he was the first to arrange and reduce to a general system, which became the first foundation of the subsequent *Mishna*. His judgment, within the limits to which he restricted it, was not less acute than straightforward,[4] precise, and strict against frivolity and arrogance,[5] equitable and indeed generous towards the weak,[6] willing to be convinced by better arguments without sacrificing in the least its reputation,[7] easily adapting itself to circumstances, quickly formed, and instinctively perceiving the right thing.[8] But as in the schools in which he was educated, and the aims of which he sought simply to prosecute with greater thoroughness and minuteness, it was the habit to deduce everything from the letter of Scripture, he paid great attention to what he considered the true principles of Biblical interpretation; and it was said that he increased to forty-nine the seven principles which Hillel the Great had formerly proposed.[9] In reality, however, the arbitrary nature of the Rabbinical method of interpretation appears nowhere more strikingly than in his hands. With his open mind, it is true, he interpreted not a few passages much more correctly than others had done,[10] and at times insisted on the literal interpretation of a text;[11] and with his most versatile mind he endeavoured to reanimate

the richest citizens of Jerusalem, Kalba Shebua, married his daughter against her father's will, and then at the desire of the family adopted a learned career; these and many similar legends about him scarcely deserve much attention.

[1] Which is observable everywhere in him, particularly in his saying regarding the boon of the day of atonement for Israel, *M.* Joma, viii. 9; further in his saying regarding the relation of mankind, Israel, and the Law, so far as definite Divine revelations exist as to these three, *M.* Aboth. iii. 14.

[2] בְּלָל is the proper term for this in the Mishna.

[3] As an example of such an application his saying regarding the coincidence of the Sabbath and Passover feast often occurs, *M.* Shabbath, xix. 1; Pesachim, vi. 2; Menachoth, xi. 3.

[4] Proofs of this are numerous, e.g. his decisions, *M.* Pesachim, vi. 2, ix. 6; Jebamoth, iv. 13; Orlah, iii. 7.

[5] E.g. *M.* Peah, iii. 6; Meilah, vi. 6; Ketuboth, ix. 3; Shebiith, iii. 10; Baba Qamma, ii. 8.

[6] As *M.* Baba Qamma, viii. 6.

[7] As in the case *M.* Cholin, ii. 4.

[8] As in the sayings concerning vows *M.* Nedarim, ix. 5, 6.

[9] See *ante*, p. 40.

[10] As in the instances, *M.* Shebuoth, ii. 5; iii. 5.

[11] As *M.* Sotah, viii. 5. On the other hand, instances of ingenious but perverse subtlety are only too frequent, e.g. when, *M.* Sanhedrin, x. 3, he seeks to establish

the driest materials by means of new principles, which afforded larger scope for the exercise of ingenuity. Thus he proposed in particular the general principle that any departure from the ordinary rule in a sentence, or a word, or a passage of Scripture, or anything at all surprising in it, must have a secret sense, which can be discovered by the exercise of ingenuity, as if God intended by it to induce men to penetrate into his more hidden meaning.[1] And this principle, which with all its seeming correctness was in the highest degree uncertain and dangerous, he applied not merely in the admonition of the community after the suggestion of Scripture, but also in determining commandments and laws. Another of his principles was that everything may be proved by everything found in Scripture, and that therefore a law may be based upon a passage of Scripture which has really nothing to do with it. With such new principles, and his forced though apparently clever application of them, he obtained wide scope for the exercise of his inexhaustible ingenuity and his inventive fertility, although in reality with all this he only transferred into the Talmudic schools in a more one-sided and ruder manner the actual aim of Philo;[2] and although in this he met at once with several Rabbis of more sober tendencies who opposed him,[3] his fundamental view of Scripture, which was the product of the sultry atmosphere of that depressing age, and his new and ingenious hermeneutics were so flattering to the idolatrous reverence of the letter of the Bible which had long been habitual in Judeanism, that they could not fail, when supported by his acuteness and enthusiasm, to meet rapidly with the loudest applause, especially as, after the destruction of Jerusalem, the endeavour to place the Bible above everything, as the one remaining visible sacred object, was more earnestly prosecuted than ever.[4] People were dazzled by the brilliant effects of this new form of teaching, which put into the hand of a Rabbi of

the proposition that the Ten Tribes will never return by means of the text, Deut. xxix. 27 (28), 'he cast them into a strange land as *it is this day*,' by the interpretation, that as the present day never returns, so they will never return. A similar case, but one which has to do with a legal decision, occurs *M.* Jebamoth, xii. 3.

[1] E.g. when in a passage of the Law the same word recurs in a somewhat different position, it is meant to point to two totally different things, as Sotah, v. 1. 4; or a strong reason in deciding great vital questions may be drawn from every twist of a letter (קוץ), *G.* Menachol, fol. 29 *b*; indeed, the accusative particle אֵת he taught must always mean *with*, *G.* Baba Qamma, fol. 40 *b*, which his pupil Aquila imitated in Greek, comp. *infra*, p. 270.

[2] Vol. vii. pp. 203 sq.

[3] His chief opponent was the highly cultured and extremely philanthropic Ismael, son of Elisha, grandson of the high-priest who fell as a martyr (vol. vii. p. 616), living at first in Rome as a slave, afterwards liberated by purchase, and then returning to his hereditary lands in Judah.

[4] See *ante*, pp. 37 sq.

this kind the power of proving everything most ingeniously from the Bible. Akîba was soon ranked higher than all the great teachers from whose school he had himself proceeded, and whose reputation in other respects he carefully refrained from destroying;[1] and, in fact, some began already in those days to exalt him even above Moses.[2] Moreover, his diligence and power of work as well as the extent of his knowledge were unlimited: he was also familiar with the depths of inquiry as to the most mysterious matters, or with the mysticism of a Philo and others; and in his later days there was hardly anyone who was not indebted for something to his stores of knowledge.

He was himself by no means blind to the jealousy, ambition, and vanity of most of the Rabbis of his time, as we may see most plainly from some of the admonitions which he is said to have addressed to his own son, Rabbi Joshua;[3] but the cheerfulness and peaceableness of his disposition, which, in spite of his astonishing industry, could not be damped, enabled him easily to get beyond all such annoyances, and never suffered him to forget the true end of all his labours—the restoration of the glory of Israel. In his views and decisions on legal questions, even when they were of the most difficult nature, the versatility of his mind sometimes degenerated into frivolity;[4] but in contrast with the gloom of his time this invincible cheerfulness was a great gain. He was one of the few Rabbis of those days who was able to get out of the most depressing phenomena of the history of Judea at that time some playful joke or some consolatory piece of wit wherever they were appropriate;[5] and the hope of his life, instead of growing old with his advanced years, seemed to rise ever higher, as if he had been sustained from an early period by some expectation derived from a passage of Scripture, as he interpreted it, that before his death, and perhaps before the lapse of a second seventy years of exile of Israel, he would witness the beginning of a

[1] E.g. Jochanan ben-Zakkai, mentioned *ante*, p. 33, Sotah, v. 2.

[2] As many really did subsequently.

[3] *G.* Pesachim, fol. 112 *a*, 'never fix thy school on the highest place of the city (the opposite accordingly of Prov. viii. 2, ix. 3), and dwell in no city the governors of which are scholars!'

[4] E.g. in his interpretation of the text on divorce, Deut. xxiv. 1, in reference to which, probably already in opposition to the new strictness of the Christian view, he permitted the most frivolous interpretation of עֶרְוַת דָּבָר, *M.* Gittin, ix. 10 (comp. *Antiquities*, p. 204). Another case of frivolous interpretation is the proof drawn from Isa. lxvi. 23 that the punishment of hell will last only twelve months, *M.* Edujoth, ii. 10; from which we see also that one of his contemporary fellow Rabbis gave a still more frivolous interpretation of it than he.

[5] E.g. it was said that in a company of pilgrims to Jerusalem, when they saw a jackal run from the Temple hill, and general depression overcame them at this token of destruction, he was able by a clever use of passages from the Bible to transform the incident into a comforting joke, *G.* Makkoth, fol. 24 *b*.

great Messianic deliverance. The idea of ever himself taking up arms against the Roman Government never occurred to him; he had not witnessed in vain the miserable failure of the armed revolt of the learned Zealots in the last great war, and he was convinced of nothing more firmly than that a Rabbi might not himself take up arms. In other respects, however, he unmistakably recurred again to the strict views of those Zealots, punished with extreme obstinacy any contact with even the mere books of Christians and Heathen,[1] and looked for the coming of the Messiah hourly who would conduct the Judean Hagiocracy to victory in the world. The mere word and simple hint of the mind of such a man produced necessarily the greatest effect, and we shall see soon what a fire they kindled.

The New Mission to the Heathen.—Aquila's Translation of the Bible.

Through such men, therefore, as this Rabbi Akîba, who undoubtedly only towered aloft amongst many like-minded men with similar modes of action, as a giant who had arrived late, Judeanism put forth all the moral force it was still possessed of with the view of attaining that Divine glory, the sacred ancient memory and prophetic outline of which continued to vividly move before its vision, or at all events of regaining as a preliminary step that power and honour in the world which it had enjoyed in the centuries preceding the destruction of the Temple. A new vivacity and activity appeared in it, as when one who has been near Death's door is about to return again to active life; and the last energies it possessed, and which were not yet fully exhausted, were put forth. But in reality it thereby only advanced for the second time to the same calamity of a revolt after the spirit of Judas the Gaulonite, which involved the true mortal peril of these last times of the Hagiocracy; and this was in circumstances which were far less favourable than those at the time of the previous war with Rome. For now a Judean nation had first to be formed, since it had been practically annihilated. And it was not even the powers of its ancient sacred priesthood that were now roused again in Judeanism, such as had been revived during the Babylonian

[1] 'Whoever reads strange (חִיצוֹנִים, heretical) books and mutters a charm over a wound is damned,' *M.* Sanhedrin, x. 1: the latter clause points still more than the first to the Christians of that time.

Exile and afterwards helped to sustain the Hagiocracy during the long period down to the second destruction of the Temple, and immediately before that event once more put forth the utmost possible efforts. Rabbi Akîba was so far from being a priest that he contributed in no small degree to destroy the little influence which the hereditary priesthood still possessed by virtue of the faith of the remnant of the nation in its sacredness.[1] Still less were genuine prophetic or political and dynastic influences now in existence, whilst the national influences were so completely broken up and isolated that it was in vain that a second Cyrus was hoped for. It was simply learning and the arts of speech and writing which, animated by the truths and hopes of the ancient religion, sought to propagate a new enthusiasm, with the hope that some happy accident might come to the assistance of their purpose. And in addition to this it was mainly rivalry with Christianity, as having sprung from its own midst, which now took possession of the Ancient Community with new force, that it might be decided whether the supremacy of the world could be wrested from the Christian Church when the latter was so mightily exerting its youthful energies to secure it. A feeling that the rule of the world must fall either to Christianity or to itself now pervades more or less clearly the Ancient Community far more deeply than ever before, urges it to oppose with quite new energy the New Community, as one which had apostatised from itself and had no right to exist, and leads it once more to gather up its utmost resources in order to make a final effort against the Heathen.

And, indeed, it is marvellous to see the new influence which the Ancient Community was once more able to exert upon Heathenism in these decades. Many Heathen who were very desirous to find a true religion might now come to doubt again whether the New Community was better than the Old. They saw that the Ancient Community once more recovered itself with vigour from the terrible calamities which had just befallen it, and that it courageously anticipated the fulfilment of its ancient hopes; on the other hand, they saw that the New Community was vehemently opposed and rejected as absolutely false by the old one, whilst it could itself apparently offer to them nothing but tribulation and persecution from

[1] Thus it was said that from displeasure at the Rabbi Eliezer, son of Azarja the priest, receiving such large tithes after the destruction of the Temple, whilst the more distinguished Rabbi Joshua, son of Chananja, who was merely a Levite, received none at all, Akîba ordered the tithes intended for Rabbi Eliezer to be laid upon a grave, where he dared not touch them, until he consented to divide them with the Levite, *G.* Jebam, fol. 86 *b*; *Jer.* Maaser Sheni, fol. 56 *b*, *c*.

all sides. Times similar to those before the destruction of Jerusalem [1] recurred, but so many Rabbis, above all the highly revered Akîba, manifestly made far greater efforts now than then to attract the Heathen from the Christians and to the Ancient Community; and the numerous long journeys which Akîba, with his great worldly wealth, made with increasing frequency,[2] were evidently not for the purpose merely of strengthening but also of extending the Judean communities. And thus a new fierce struggle between Judeanism and Christianity arose, confined, it is true, as long as the former possessed no temporal power, to words and learning, but in this department attempting everything possible with new weapons.[3] In this new state of confusion nothing was more common than for Heathen of the same country to go over now to the Ancient and then to the New Community, to become Christians after being Judeans, and Judeans after being Christians, or at all events Jewish Christians; or they lost all respect for both, and fell back into hopeless Heathenism, especially as amongst the Judeans themselves, and still more amongst Christians, such extremely various opinions were contending for the mastery.[4]

The memory of one more than usually remarkable conversion from Heathenism, which may serve us as an example of many others, has been preserved from the commotion of these missionary efforts; although this example would not have been preserved if it had not been fixed in the memory by another remarkable circumstance: for the way in which a new translation of the Old Testament into Greek was made in this period could never afterwards be forgotten. When Hadrian came to Jerusalem (the story of this event ran in somewhat later times), to found there his new city, he entrusted the execution of his building projects to a respected Heathen from Sinope, named Aquila, who was connected with the Emperor by marriage.[5] In Jerusalem he was converted to Christianity by the miracles which he saw performed there in the Christian Church,

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 474 sq.

[2] These journeys are often spoken of: at one time he travelled to Nisibis, Nahardea, and Gazaka, in Parthia, at another to Rome, Gaul, Arabia, and Africa.

[3] The arguments used by the Judean scholars against Christianity may be seen best in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* (*ante*, p. 149), which, according to its introduction, capp. 1, 2, is placed in the time of the last great Judean war.

[4] The most vivid picture of men of this kind who after they had lost all faith in Judeanism and Christianity fell back again into Heathenism is given by the Clementine Homilies (*ante*, p. 126); and although the work was written after the middle of the second century, such delineations belong still to this earlier period.

[5] It is a wholly baseless modern conjecture that this Aquila is identical with the man of this name met with vol. vii. 377; there is no other point of likeness between the two than that of their names, and this is as accidental as their common native country being Pontus.

as though he might find in it satisfaction for his need of the miraculous. But when the Christians saw him continuing in his astrological superstitions,[1] and strongly censured him on that account, he seceded to the Judean community, having first been circumcised, and became a most zealous Judean. This was the later and greatly altered form of the reminiscences of his life;[2] but a literary production of his, which was preserved for a considerable time, and of which we possess still many disconnected fragments, amply confirms the essential points in it. That production is his Greek translation of the Bible, a work of an extraordinary character, such as could be produced in the Ancient Community only by the new and mighty zeal of these times, a zeal which might easily become very impure. The translation of the ancient sacred books into Greek had for a long period been very earnestly prosecuted by many Hellenists,[3] and in our period not a few Hebrew-Aramaic books were being constantly translated afresh into Greek; but for a long time there had now been but one Greek version of all the principal books of the Old Testament in undisputed use as the best, which was called the translation of the Seventy. Yet, great as was the authority of this version as late as the age of the Apostles, even amongst the Judeans, it had from that time fallen more and more into discredit. The occasion of this was the controversy as to the interpretation of Messianic and other passages of the Old Testament which arose between the Old and the New Community, and grew more and more violent and inextricable. Christians, who since Paul's labours had gone more and more amongst the Heathen, following that apostle's example, used chiefly the Septuagint, which was then held in high esteem in Palestine, and in their application of Biblical passages to the Messiah were in the habit of appealing to it. But the Judeans came by degrees on that account to dislike this version, and resolved to appeal to the Hebrew text alone, or, at most, to better Greek translations only. For a time not a few Christians themselves preferred in this controversy to go back to the Hebrew text, and translated into Greek on their own account the most necessary passages direct from it, deeming that the safest course.[4] But the example of Paul had in this respect become of pre-

[1] *Genethlialogia*, vol. vii. 200.

[2] In Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, §§ 14, 15, comp. §§ 2, 13. It cannot be a purely arbitrary supposition that Aquila went to Jerusalem forty-seven years after the destruction of the Temple, that is, in the first year of Hadrian; there is evidently in the account a genuine tradition, as it accords with all other historical indications.

[3] See vol. v. pp. 249 sq.

[4] This important fact appears plainly from the weighty instance examined in the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* ii. pp. 214 sq.

ponderating influence, and Christianity had already been sent forth into the Greek and Roman world as its true sphere. Then came the destruction of the Temple, which quickly separated the two Communities more and more widely, and the Ancient Community was seized with a profound dislike of all Greek and Roman culture, and even of the use of Greek books. In these circumstances the Rabbis put their ban with growing rigour upon the Septuagint as the Christian Bible,[1] and inspired all the minds which came under their influence with a deep horror of it, so that afterwards it became quite unused amongst the Judeans. As, therefore, dislike of Greek books had then already become strong,[2] it is at first sight surprising that a new Greek version of the Bible could be executed even by a proselyte with the sanction of the Rabbis. But in these very decades intelligent men such as Akîba entertained fresh and stronger hope of an early wide conversion of the Heathen, and could therefore approve of a Greek version of the Bible, if executed in accordance with their hostile feeling towards Christianity.

We know with sufficient particularity that the powerful and wealthy Aquila showed the greatest respect after his conversion for the chief Rabbis,[3] and his version of the Bible is carried out quite after Akîba's views and spirit. It is literal in the extreme, and, indeed, slavishly close beyond all reason, so that (especially as there was then no accurate knowledge of the ancient Hebrew) its Greek is often perfectly unintelligible and meaningless when there is no necessity for it whatever. In this he followed Akîba, who, as we have seen,[4] could not take anything in the Scriptures literally enough; and the Gentile pupil, like other zealous disciples of a teacher such as Akîba, naturally went still farther than his master in this respect. Those passages especially in which Christians found the Messianic prophecies most decidedly in their favour he translated the more strangely and divergently with evident purpose,[5] following in this the aims of his master. When his translation appeared it

[1] They soon went so far that they regarded the day on which the seventy elders wrote the Law in Greek for the *King*, תלמי (Ptolemy) as identical with the calamitous day when 'Israel made for itself the golden calf,' see the *Jer.* Masseketh *Sepher Tora*, i. 8, 9. in the *Septem libri Talm. Hieros.* ed. Kirchheim, Frankft. 1851. Thus was the previous exaggerated estimate of the translation avenged! (Vol. v. pp. 249 sq.) However, its final rejection was connected less with the new controversies with the Christians than with the general proscription of all Greek and Roman culture, of which we spoke, *ante*, p. 44.

[2] See *ante*, p. 44.

[3] For instance, it is said that at the burial of Gamaliel (*ante*, pp. 34 sq.) he lavished immense sums and declared on the occasion that a man like him outweighed a hundred kings.

[4] *Ante*, p. 264.

[5] E.g. when he substituted *νεᾶνις* for *παρθένος*, Isa. vii. 14, the change was evidently directed against the Christians of the time.

met with the complete approval of Akîba and other Rabbis; it was also so much considered and read by Christians that the effect it was intended to produce was fully attained in their case likewise.[1] Aquila published a second edition of his version with improvements.[2] As thus aroused by Aquila, a new passion for translating the Old Testament into Greek was exhibited, and Samaritans and Ebionites especially, as possessing some knowledge of the languages, took part in the work. Christianity had in this respect also the marvellous power of stirring new life. We are not now able to fix the year in which Aquila's version appeared, but at latest it may have been 120 A.D.[3]

The New Sanguinary Risings.

In a time of such mental excitement it was, as above stated, little more than accident at what time and place the sanguinary risings should first break out; and since these first risings, however terrible their nature, had soon a much more terrible ending, a somewhat clearer recollection of them has been preserved among those only who stood outside the pale of the Ancient Community. Among the Jews themselves the memory of these most lamentable events, which, moreover, took place almost entirely in the countries outside Palestine, was so immediately thoroughly obscured that we now do not even know what pretext the insurgents at first brought forward for their sanguinary risings. In general we can plainly make out two things only. First, that these insurrections broke out simultaneously precisely in those countries which we can call more especially Hellenistic: in them the Jews still lived most thickly

[1] When Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* capp. 43, 67, 68, 77, 78, repeatedly complains bitterly that Jews translated Isa. vii. 14 by νεᾶνις, he can only refer to Aquila's version; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 21. 1, also complains of this, comp. Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* v. 8. 10. Though in this passage Irenæus names with and even before Aquila the Ephesian Theodotion, who had likewise been a Judean proselyte and had translated as such, Theodotion nevertheless lived somewhat later and was an Ebionite, according to other accounts. Aquila is probably often confounded with Theodotion or Symmachus, especially in the reminiscence in *Vajjiqra Rabba*, par. 33, on Prov. xviii. 21. In the *T. Jer.* he has still his proper Greek name Aqilas: but when, on the contrary, in the *T. Bab.* Aboda Zara, fol. 11 *a*, and elsewhere he is called Anqelos (Onkelos) and is confounded with the author of the oldest Targum, these are later confusions. The surname *bar-Kalonymus* may have descended from Aquila to this so-called Onkelos. The name סומכוס occurs as that of a Rabbi, *M.* Sopherim, v. 16.

[2] As we may see from the works of Jerome, who often quotes the two editions. [See on this, and Aquila's version generally, Field's edition of Origen's Hexapla, *Origenis Hexaplorum quæ supersunt: sive Veterum Interpretum Græcorum in totum V. T. fragmenta*, Oxon. 1875.]

[3] According to Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* cap. 13, it appeared in the twelfth year of Hadrian, 129 A.D., but as he nowhere distinguishes the two editions of the translation this date may be that of the second.

congregated in populous communities, and their number in these countries particularly had very largely increased since the great dispersion under Vespasian, as most of the refugees preferred to attach themselves to these communities, which were even then so ancient, and, on the whole, still tolerably flourishing. And it was just in these Hellenistic countries that the most violent friction had been felt, and that bloody conflicts had broken out between Judeans and Heathens before, during, and shortly after the last great war; so that now the same deadly conflict only blazed out again in bright flames that had been with difficulty suppressed by the heaviest punishments in the time of the Flavians. This conflict was therefore, generally speaking, owing to the same ultimate causes, only that now the situation was much more complicated on account of the rapid growth of Christianity in all these countries, and because the animosity so long kept down by force now burst forth all the more madly; and if many Judeans in these Hellenistic countries had during the last war shown themselves less energetic than the Zealots wished,[1] and had then too late caught some of their fire, they now seemed determined to make their neglect doubly good. Secondly, we see plainly that these risings, which spread so rapidly, as if by some contagion, over the countries mentioned, did not break out till Trajan's second Parthian war, 115–117 A.D., when he was staying so long with the flower of the whole Roman army in the extreme East, conquering the countries beyond the Tigris, and even Southern Babylonia, down to the Persian Gulf, and had, as it were, disappeared from the view of the Western world. What the attitude of the Parthian Judeans towards Trajan was during his first and second Parthian wars we do not now know in detail. It is, however, not improbable that they fought against him much more fiercely than the other Parthian subjects, that hopes were at length entertained of the co-operation of the Parthian with the Roman Judeans for the recapture of Jerusalem, after these hopes which were cherished in the last war had been so little fulfilled,[2] and that the journeys of Akîba into the Parthian lands were connected with these expectations.[3] In addition to this, a fresh generation had arisen in Judea, full of the old hereditary hatred of everything not Judean, passionately hostile to Rome, which was then for the first time universally compared to Edom rather than to Babylon,[4] and daring enough to desire to measure their

[1] See vol. vii. p. 524.
[2] Vol. vii. pp. 517, 580.
[3] *Ante*, p. 268.
[4] Since the time that the Herod family, which had sprung from Edom, ruled only by the aid of the Romans, it

strength afresh in open warfare with all the friends of Rome. Moreover, the succession in the Roman empire was at this time uncertain, as in the latter days of Nero, since the childless Trajan put off the nomination of a successor till the day of his death.

As far as we can now see,[1] the insurrection first broke out in Cyrene, the town and district in which such numbers of Judeans had now dwelt for so many centuries, and in which the rebellion at the end of the former war had longest continued.[2] At the head of the insurgents there stood a certain Andreas, but he seems to have been so little able to restrain their fury, when once let loose, that they committed the most extreme atrocities against 'Romans and Greeks.' They compelled many to fight with wild beasts, or with one another, in the Roman theatres (as if only in revenge for what had once been inflicted on great numbers of Judeans,[3] and was apparently still inflicted here and there on individuals); they also sawed many in pieces,[4] and even besmeared themselves with the blood of some of their victims, and clothed themselves in their intestines and skins, and ate their flesh:[5] in all 220,000 who were not Judeans are said to have fallen at that time. This happened A.D. 115–16. The next year the insurrection broke out with like atrocities in Alexandria and the whole of Egypt; but the Gentiles gathered now in yet larger numbers at Alexandria, overpowered the Judeans in that town, and quenched the rebellion. The Judeans of Cyrene, under a new leader, Lucuas, did indeed advance into Upper and Lower Egypt, ravaging the country; and fears were already entertained that the Judeans would, from the basis of Alexandria, get possession of the ships and navigation, as they had also tried to do in the former war.[6] But Marcius Turbo,[7]

was natural to call the Roman dominion itself Edom, and to pray for its destruction in such words of the Old Testament as Is. lxiii. 1–6 and similar passages: but nevertheless until the time before us we find Rome always rather compared to and represented as Babylon; and not until Christianity grew ever stronger in the Roman empire was it fully appropriate to compare this empire to the wicked brother Edom. But the earliest beginning of this is seen in 4 Ezra vi. 8, 9.

[1] According to Cass. Dio, lxviii. 32; on the other hand, Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 2, where he follows Heathen but various sources, mentions Egypt first, and does not speak of Cyrene at all. Orosius, *Hist.* vii. 12, relates the whole in a few words—the most definitely, we might say.

[2] See vol. vii. p. 616.

[3] See vol. vii. pp. 609–611.

[4] Which certainly had occurred before, vol. iv. p. 211.

[5] Such barbarities do not occur before in the whole course of this history. But of what were not at least some individuals of this nation capable in this its last madness? We have no reason to reject these statements.

[6] See vol. vii. p. 548.

[7] Thus briefly mentioned in Spart. *Hadr.* cap. 5, and probably distinct from *Lucianus* Turbo, who is also frequently met with with Hadrian, *ibid.* capp. 4, 7, 9, 15. On the other hand, according to Eusebius, at the commencement of the insurrection a certain *Lupus* was governor

who had been commissioned by Trajan to quell the rebellion, with a sufficient force of infantry, cavalry, and also of war-vessels, at last scattered them after much fighting, and killed their leader. After their defeat a large body of them appears, on this very occasion, to have fled farther south across the Roman frontier, partly to Ethiopia, partly to Yemen, where in later times we find numerous settlements of Jews.[1] At that time, too, the great Synagogue of Alexandria appears to have been destroyed, of the magnificence and enormous size of which later generations still spoke so much.[2] In Cyprus, which for centuries had been getting more and more thickly peopled with Judeans, about the same time a rebellion was raging, under a leader named Artemion, which, in point of barbarity, fell nothing short of that in Cyrene. It was especially the town of Salamis that suffered from the passion for destruction which, like a madness, had suddenly seized the Judeans; and it is said that no fewer than 240,000 human beings lost their lives through it. But here, too, the revenge of the Romans was such that all Judeans were extirpated, and none of the nation might thereafter place his foot upon this large island.[3] We cannot fail to see that the rebellion spread also to Asia Minor, especially to the neighbouring country of Lycia.[4]

But the Parthian Judeans, in his own neighbourhood, aroused Trajan's gravest suspicions, so that he commanded his tried and bravest general, Lusius Quietus, to drive all Judeans out of Mesopotamia at least, that they might not become tale-bearers. This man, of Maurisian descent, and accustomed to the bloodiest wars,[5] then executed the punishment of the Parthian Judeans with such utter want of feeling, killing many thousands in a single battle, that Trajan appointed him Governor of Palestine, as this most dangerous region of all

of Egypt, and his name occurs in connection with the former rebellion, see vol. vii. p. 616.

[1] This origin of the Himyaritic and Ethiopic Jews may at any rate be considered the most probable, comp. v. pp. 4 sq.; vii. p. 300. But after the war with Bar-Kôkheba also many may have been driven thither.

[2] Comp. the description in the two Gemaras on Sukka, v. 1, fol. 51 *b*. If it had been already destroyed under Vespasian, we should have had information of it from that time, see vol. vii. p. 616.

[3] As Cassius Dio, lxviii. 32, says plainly enough; the statement about Salamis is now found alone in Euseb. *Chron.* ii. p. 283.

[4] Though we have now only one authority for this in the words *Lycia* ac Palestina rebelles animos offerebant (at the beginning of Hadrian's reign) Spart. *Hadr.* cap. 5.

[5] When his simple name is mentioned, he is always called *Lusius* (Lysias); he was, however, recalled after a few years on account of Hadrian's jealousy, and met with a miserable end, see Spart. *Hadr.* cap. 7. As commander in Edessa he seems to occur in the history of Scherbil, the martyr of that place; comp. Cureton's *Ancient Syriac Documents*, p. 45. 18.

became more and more involved in the general conflagration.[1] Trajan was, indeed, soon obliged to leave the Parthian Judeans quite in peace again, as he died at Selinus, in Cilicia, in the year 117, on his way back from the East; whilst Hadrian, by a concession, that for the moment appeared wise, at once freed himself from all those Parthian complications. But during these last days of Trajan's reign and the beginning of that of Hadrian, Lusius restored the threatened peace in Palestine with such violence that the Judean war-spirit, which had been so uselessly awakened and so forcibly quenched, seemed now at any rate to have been everywhere finally extinguished.

It is impossible, amid all these scattered statements, to ascertain with certainty the real condition of affairs in Palestine. We do not now even know the name of any Judean leader who may at that time have in Palestine itself rebelled against the Romans; and yet it is inconceivable that the Judeans, who had long been cheered by the hope of the rebuilding of their Temple,[2] should not then have gathered together amid the ruins of Jerusalem and tried every means of compelling Trajan to keep those promises.[3] And we also still possess[4] the fragment of a book which can sufficiently testify to what a height of enthusiasm the Messianic hopes had at that time again risen. The enigma is, however, partly explained when we consider that about that time the neighbouring countries, Phœnicia and Arabia, were in rebellion,[5] and the war around Jerusalem might thus seem only as it were accidental and of secondary importance; and, in fact, it was in general the worst mistake of the Judeans of that time that in their wide dispersion they everywhere rebelled so quickly and strove to excite the animosity of the peoples among whom they dwelt against Rome and yet nowhere acted in accordance with a general plan. And what a destructive effect these wars had upon the Judean schools also can be perceived from the fact that from that time they altogether changed their locality. For they

[1] According to Spartianus particularly and Euseb. *Chron.* ii. 283; coins also were struck in memory of the victory over the Parthian Judeans, Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* II. vi. p. 464.

[2] See p. 18.

[3] As a matter of fact this position is with great brevity quite correctly stated in Eutychius' *Ann.* i. p. 351.

[4] See pp. 56 sq.

[5] It was now that the kingdom of the Nabatæans, of which so much has been said above (vol. v. p. 351) and elsewhere, with its capital Petra and so many other cities that were soon very prosperous again, was first made a Roman province, as is briefly stated, Eutrop. *Hist.* x. 2, and as is so brilliantly confirmed by the many inscriptions from those districts which have now come to light again. But the fact that Sidon's autonomous coins cease A.D. 120, and that Tyre, on the contrary, is again greatly distinguished by Hadrian (comp. Suidas s.vv. Παῦλος, Τύριος) must stand in close connection with this circumstance.

remained at first [1] as near as possible to the ruins of Jerusalem; but inasmuch as all this southern district seems to have been terribly devastated again, and the learned probably most of all felt themselves unsafe, we find them afterwards continuing their schools principally in Galilean towns.

2. *Bar-Kôkheba and his Reign.*

And in point of fact this terribly bloody and yet so completely useless afterpiece of the great war of half a century before might well have been the end of all such conflicts, which were only like the last convulsions of the dying frame of one whose spirit, in spite of weakness, clings to life. The reason they were not the end was that there was some one thing left on the part of the Roman Government, and also on that of the dismembered nation, which made each of them consider that they ought to make trial of this or that as yet untried means of accomplishing their diametrically opposite objects; and as on both sides that one thing was intrinsically wrong, it could only again kindle the disastrous war and destroy the last fibres of Israel's national strength.

The Roman Government could now with justice be displeased with a people which, though dispersed in every direction, and only kept together by its faith, could so little appreciate the mitigation of the legal measures against it which had been brought about since Domitian's fall. For even the decree forbidding them to visit the site of Jerusalem and to settle there was evidently, since Nerva's mild rule, no longer enforced; on the contrary, many Judeans now lived among its ruins, some of them in order to ransack them and look for treasure; but when on one occasion a tolerably well-preserved old building, which was looked upon as Solomon's tomb, suddenly fell in, many regarded this as an evil omen for the future fate of the country.[2] It is nowhere hinted that Trajan before the last years of his life inflicted any special severity upon the nation, and yet it had suffered itself to be carried away to the commission of such horrible atrocities, perhaps here and there provoked, at the time when the Roman empire was engaged in the Parthian war! It is therefore not surprising that the Romans

[1] See p. 33.

[2] This is one of the two evil omens of which later, after the unfortunate ending of the last great movement of the people, so much was made that the recollection of them was preserved even in Cassius Dio, *Hist.* lxix. 14; the other omen that wolves and jackals were seen running 'into the towns' is evidently connected with the legend mentioned in the history of Akiba, *ante*, p. 265.

now thought themselves obliged to prevent by severer measures the repetition of such atrocities. But it is generally not easy to invent continually more severe measures for keeping down a subject people which are not calculated themselves to increase the evil; and at any rate the Romans on that occasion committed a serious error in this respect. According to all indications they wished to take still more stringent measures in order completely to put an end to the nationality and unity of the Judeans, and of the two measures which they actually resorted to the one was unnecessarily offensive, and the other altogether impracticable.

The first of these measures concerned Jerusalem. This city, the restoration of which had long been promised,[1] was now at length to be really rebuilt, but not in the least according to the notions and wishes of the Judeans, but, on the contrary, as a purely Roman and Heathen city. It was to be a colony of Roman soldiers, and therefore its internal arrangement that of a splendid Heathen town; as it was thought that it would then foster the right feeling towards Rome in those districts and serve as a strong fortress in the frequent wars in the East. Even the entrance into it was, under these circumstances, prohibited to the Judeans, as a matter of course.[2] In fact, a similar measure had been previously successfully employed in the case of Cæsarea Palestinæ,[3] and the Judean aspiration of the time could not have had a more deadly blow struck at it than the execution of this design. But of course it included not only a complete prostration of all the burning hopes of the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple, as the great sacred centre of all Judeans, but also a provocation, not to say mockery, of the holiest feelings of the nation. And yet this means of destroying the national unity was an easy one in comparison with the other to which at that time recourse was had—the prohibition of circumcision,[4] by which the further

[1] p. 18.

[2] According to the narrative in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 6, the Heathen settlement was not undertaken before the close of the next great war; but the narrative in Cassius Dio, *Hist.* lxix. 12, which entirely differs from his, and is as a whole much more accurate, is certainly on this point nearer the truth. Eusebius' less accurate narrative could, however, easily arise, as the restoration of the city cannot have been altogether finished until after the war, and it can only then have received the name *Ælia Capitolina*; as a fact we do not possess any coins struck by the city of so early a date. But when later a Christian church also was raised in this Ælia, the Jews asserted that Hadrian had rebuilt Jerusalem to please the Christians, and that the war with Bar-Kôkheba had been caused by this; and this kind of narrative found its way into Eutychius' *Ann.* i. p. 353.

[3] See vol. vii. p. 495.

[4] Our only information on this point is now preserved simply in the words, *moverunt ea tempestate* (when Hadrian was in Syria, about 130 A.D.) *et Judæi bellum quod vetabantur mutilare genitalia*, in Spart. *Hadr.* cap. 14, but we have

existence of the nation on the earth was in fact to be made impossible. Both imperial decrees were in all probability issued by Trajan himself in the last year but one of his life, when he received in the remote East trustworthy accounts of the rebellious character of the Judeans that nothing could repress. Hadrian, who preferred peaceful measures wherever they were possible, would scarcely have issued them at the commencement of his reign; but as he was Trajan's governor of Syria [1] during the last Parthian war, he was obliged to join in the execution of the imperial commands, and Lusius, as governor of Palestine, was the right man to carry out the sternest orders of his master. The rebuilding of Jerusalem as a Heathen city was also then doubtless immediately taken in hand; whilst a prohibition of circumcision must not only produce the greatest irritation, but must also in the end always remain incapable of execution.

Thus even before Trajan's death the terrible times of an Antiochus Epiphanes seemed to have returned for the 'people of God,' and it is easy to comprehend how at this time the last energies of resistance to the uttermost should be profoundly roused and violently called into action. As long indeed as the new emperor, Hadrian, had in the first years of his reign to struggle seriously with the state of affairs in Asia and Egypt, which under Trajan had at last become much disturbed, he was astute enough to give the Judeans some hope. It must have been flattering to them that he inflicted a very severe punishment on Lucius Quietus; [2] and by the agency of the above-mentioned [3] Aquila he even encouraged the expectations of the rebuilding of the Temple which had been again revived by Nerva.[4] He cannot, however, have been very much in earnest with regard to these alleviations of their lot, as the Judeans themselves must have soon perceived. And yet, as the Romans took wrong measures for bringing about the final ruin of the nation, so also the nation, in order to defend itself against them, now on its part had recourse to a measure which was equally mistaken. It is true it appeared to the people to be the only one left untried, and it really, as if in a supernatural manner, once more accomplished all that could be expected from it in the final crisis; but nevertheless, being intrinsically wrong, it could only the more accelerate the utter final ruin.

every reason to consider it correct; and Spartianus does not say that Hadrian had himself issued this prohibition. Bardesanes also (in Cureton's *Spic. Syr.* p. 19) speaks of it not long afterwards.

[1] According to Cassius Dio, lxix. 1 sq.

[2] See *ante*, p. 274.

[3] *Ante*, p. 268.

[4] *Ante*, p. 260.

The Judeans were apparently once more in just the same position as they were in the last days of Nero, when the most desperate resistance to Rome with all their united efforts seemed the one thing that could possibly accomplish their purpose, only that now everything had become on the side of the Judeans incomparably more unfavourable and desperate, while on the other hand the real power over the minds of the people lay now, more than then even, purely in the hands of the scholars. What was now to be the advice of an Akîba? What part ought he himself to take? The scholars, warned by the sad end of the learned Zealots of that time, had now long given up the idea of themselves becoming warriors or military commanders. If, however, they meditated more profoundly upon the failure of the resistance to Rome, which was at the time so imposing, and at first a long while so successful, they could not help seeing that one of the principal reasons of that failure lay in the want of a single, united, and rigorous control, or (in other words) in the fact that at that time a Grecian, or rather an ancient Mosaic commonwealth (republic), without a visible king, was considered the only right constitution, and that this conception had been actively adhered to so persistently to the last moment.[1] Similarly, it might seem, the last great insurrections were failures only because the nation had been without any firm bond of union. And could the Hagiocracy attain its objects solely by the most rigid adherence to the ancient Mosaic method? Did not the ancient sacred history show of what great advantage a human king might prove to the State? Was there no Messianic hope in Israel which it might be foolish to transfer altogether into the distant future? Did not the present desperate times demand rigorous centralisation and united control such as only a king recognised by the community could give? Ought not most properly Cæsar, as king of the world, to be opposed by a king of Israel, who of course might be guided by the law of the true religion and its interpreters? And if the Christians were so closely united even by their merely celestial Messiah, as was seen at that time in general at least, why should an actual king be of less benefit to the true Israel?

And just as in all past times, when the spirit of this nation had been roused, it had been the magic power of prophecy that had assisted and guided it, so now also undoubtedly prophecies appeared—including written ones—as the art and influence of

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 503 sq. and 528 sq.

writing at that time certainly once more increased in the nation. But if these new writings appeared only in Hebrew, as we have reason to suppose,[1] it is not to be wondered at that soon after the suppression of this last great insurrection they were lost in the general deluge of Hebrew literature, of which we shall speak below in the history of the Canon; for we now possess no writing of this kind from that period. And yet, according to all indications, the idea of a son of Joseph as the Messiah, already mentioned,[2] has been preserved in a new prophetic work of that time, A Messiah in Israel was also wished for, only not the one of whom the Christians boasted.

To what a height the national courage was raised in this period can be seen with peculiar clearness in one rare indication. At the close of the Maccabean times the Pharisees had fixed a number of days in the year[3] on which the nation should rejoice in the newly won victories both over the Heathen and over their internal foes, as if the annual feast of Purim[4] had been no longer sufficiently recent and real. This series of anniversary days could be at suitable opportunities increased, but after the terribly sad ending of the war with Vespasian this was assuredly not thought of. Now, however, two most characteristic days were added to this calendar: one commemorative of *the joyful tidings that the Judeans might not cease to observe the precepts of the Law*,[5] tidings which Aquila may have brought them from Rome,[6] and which at the time must have had a great effect. The other was the *day of Trajan*,[7] which was to be celebrated just like a feast of Purim of the newest kind, and was therefore placed on the 12th day of the last month in the year, after a day of Nicanor had already been altered to the 13th as another precedent for it.[8] Trajan had died on his way back from the last Parthian campaign at Selinus, in Cilicia, on the Syrian frontier, and his governor had also soon afterwards fallen unexpectedly.[9] As, therefore,

[1] See *ante*, p. 270.
[2] Vol. vi. p. 121.
[3] Vol. v. pp. 380 sq.
[4] Vol. v. pp. 230 sq.
[5] The 28th of Adâr (March). Since it is always the day of the month only that is mentioned in this commemorative calendar, it is often now very doubtful at first sight what year and what historical event is referred to in the brief notices; and even the later Rabbinical interpreters of them often offer guesses only. But the extremely modest ground for rejoicing—the concession that they *should not cease to observe* their old legal injunctions, of itself points to these most oppressed times.
[6] *Ante*, p. 268.
[7] The name is generally written טוריינים, as if a name *Turrianus*, or the actual Roman name *Turranius*, were meant. But only a Roman of Trajan's importance can originally have been meant; although the interpreters soon became doubtful about him also, the more he was afterwards confounded with Hadrian, and only the latter talked of.
[8] Vol. v. p. 321.
[9] *Ante*, p. 274.

the nation had formerly exulted in their deliverance from the Persian and then from the Greek domination, so, in the rejoicing of the annual Trajan's Day, they were to hope soon to be freed from that of Rome; and the recollection of several similar quite recent deliverances was connected with it. Two rich brothers of Alexandria, Pappus and Lollianus, who had escaped from the above-mentioned[1] devastations in their town to Laodicea, on the coast of Syria, and were now, as money-changers, supporting with their wealth the crowds of Judeans that were pouring into Palestine and Jerusalem again, became involved in a dispute about words with the Heathen magistrates, and were already under sentence of death, when the unexpected removal and punishment of the governor saved them.[2] With this and similar stories the joy and hope of the new day of remembrance were kept up, as if the old days of David, or even of the Maccabees, could now return.

Still, such were the thoughts, anticipations, and endeavours that more and more took possession of Akîba and his followers; and this Rabbi, with his imperturbable calmness, was in his old age, which retained the strength of youth, enterprising and daring enough to take this view and to rouse all to enthusiasm on its behalf. To try a king of Israel was the only expedient which, if a last mortal struggle was to be risked with the Roman empire, seemed now to be left; the possibility of having a monarch was not precluded by the ancient religion, and it seems as if this last possible means of restoring the former Hagiocracy, or even of ruling the world by it, had to be tried before the last strength and hope of the Hagiocracy departed for ever. Whether this Rabbi Akîba in looking for a Messiah who should appear as soon as possible and be received with enthusiasm was like a John the Baptist could be conclusively shown by the result only, but could easily be foreseen by all who were not blinded by the false light of the Hagiocracy, which had now been nearly 700 years in existence.

For the moment, however, in spite of the profound state of suspense into which the last imperial commands had thrown all the more faithful Judeans, even an Akîba could do nothing but quietly prepare the minds of the people for such a hope, and at the same time keep a watchful eye on anyone who might perhaps be most suitable to fulfil them; the general dejection was at the time very great, and, besides, the new rule of Ælius Hadri-

[1] *Ante*, p. 273.

[2] Comp. Bereshith Rabba, cap. 64, with the stories on the 12th Adâr of M'gillath Ta'anith. Afterwards, however, these two brothers are said to have been martyrs.

anus at first promised the best that could for the moment be hoped for. Nor was the restoration of Jerusalem by the Heathen colony as yet so far advanced as to preclude the obtaining something from it by humble entreaties. For the report was soon circulated through the provinces that the gracious emperor would visit them all, and, of his own accord, meet their wants; and when in 129 Cæsarea, which had been of such critical importance in the former war,[1] and Emmaus, which had been made a Roman settlement by Vespasian,[2] were destroyed by earthquakes, the prophecy, perhaps originating in Akîba's ingenuity, nevertheless quickly spread amongst the people that the fall of Cæsarea, which was such a painful thorn in the side of the Judeans, was an omen of the speedy restoration of Israel and Jerusalem. So when Hadrian, *circa* A.D. 130,[3] came from Syria to Judea and Egypt, and promised in the latter country to visit Judea again, we can imagine with what zeal the Judeans laid their petitions and representations before him. When he had remained a considerable time at Alexandria, in a confidential letter in a way not less witty than biting, as his manner was, he expressed it as his opinion that the Judean, Samaritan, and Christian ecclesiastics there were all alike nothing but magicians and all worshipped only the one god Serapis, but that when the Judean Patriarch came from Palestine (where he had been educated in the Rabbinical schools) to Egypt, he prayed sometimes to Serapis and sometimes to Christ.[4] So little did he understand the profounder differences of these religions and their common distance from Paganism, and so peaceable also did the Judeans appear to him to be. Yet, how soon was he to find himself deeply deceived on the latter point! For when he left Palestine the second time, without having fulfilled the wishes of the Judeans, the leaders of the conspiracy determined, without further delay, to proceed to open rebellion; the whole of the Holy Land suddenly rose in arms, and the Messiah, to whom Akîba wished to point his followers, had at last (A.D. 132)[5] been found.

[1] Vol. vii. pp. 495, 505.

[2] Vol. vii. p. 613.

[3] It has not, at any rate, so far been proved that he had already been in Palestine once before, about A.D. 120 or so, as Imperator. When he came to Judea he was welcomed, as in the other provinces which he visited, by memorial coins with the inscription *Adventui Aug. Judææ* and suitable figures; but that he had already been there *Greppo* has failed to prove in his *Mémoire sur les voyages de l'empereur Adrien* (Paris, 1842) p. 181 ff. Comp. Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* II. vi. p. 496.

[4] This letter of Hadrian's has been preserved in Flavius Vopiscus' *Saturninus*, cap. 8 (in the *Scriptores Hist. Aug. sex.*); it appears to be undoubtedly authentic, and is at the same time one of the earliest witnesses to the spread of Christianity in Egypt.

[5] The chronology is now corrupt in *Sêder 'Olam rabba*, cap. 30; but if the

This man was a certain *Simon*, of whom we do not know so much as the name of his family and father, as he always calls himself on his coins simply Simon;[1] and this name even is now known to us from his coins only. When his power was sufficiently established for him to think that he might restore the kingdom of *the Freedom of Israel* or *of Jerusalem*, as it had existed in the four years of the last war, and that he might immediately boast of it on his coins, he called himself on them not king but *Prince* (Nasî) of Israel, after an ancient Mosaic name, which, it was believed, could be more easily justified according to the Pentateuch. But his pretensions were evidently Messianic: he apparently put a star upon his coins in remembrance of a prophecy of the Old Testament at that time always Messianically interpreted, to be found in the sacred Book of the Law itself,[2] and hence liked to be called in the language of the country at the time *Bar-Kôkheba*,[3] i.e. Son of the Star or of Heaven. It was under this popular title that he became most famous, and Heathen soon ridiculed his having arrogated to himself so magnificent a name though but a robber and a king over slaves only;[4] but

right numbers are restored, the way in which they got wrong is easily seen. According to the present text 24 years elapsed between the war of Vespasian and that of Titus, 16 between the latter and that of Ben-Koziba, and this last continued 2½ years; but as only 22 is the total then obtained, it might be correctly conjectured that at the beginning 4 years should be written instead of 24, and the war of Titus was as a fact about 4 years after the commencement of that of Vespasian; if further 16 had arisen out of 62 (just as at least 52 has been preserved in *Séder 'Olam zutta*, and 53, differing but little from it, in Eutychius, *Ann.* i. p. 353) we should get the year A.D. 132. Without this supposition the 52 years between the destruction of the Temple and that of Baethter would be quite meaningless. But קימום, the reading in some MSS., should be read instead of טימום, so that we might suppose the war of Lusius *Quietus* (although this name would more correctly be written קואטוס) (*ante*, p. 274) is intended; then for 24 we must read 46, the 16 years are right, and the final result therefore the same as before. And further the year 135 is fixed by Ariston of Pella in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 6 as that of the end of the war; and most of the other Judean accounts also speak not of 2½ but of 3½ years as the duration of the insurrection. This half of 7 does indeed appear, since Daniel ix. 27, too standing a term for disastrous years for us to be able to consider it of itself historical; but all historical testimony is here too unanimous, and the coins do not directly contradict this apparent fact. Comp. the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1861, pp. 697 sq.

[1] I have more fully discussed all that relates to these coins in my essay on the Judean coins, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1855, pp. 119 sq. and *ibid.* pp. 646 sq.; comp. later the same *Gel. Anz.* 1862, pp. 845 sq. The coins continue only down to the second year of the new government, are for the most part very indifferently executed, and were finally certainly struck at Baethter, although they are of many different kinds; see illustrations of them in De Saulcy's *Numism. Judaïque*, pl. xi.–xv. and comp. also Cavedoni's *Biblische Numismatik*, ii. Hanover, 1856. Many Roman coins, especially of Trajan, are found simply restamped at the command of Bar-Kôkheba; a recollection of this is preserved in the legend *G.* 'Abôda zara, fol. 52 *b*.

[2] Num. xxiv. 17: how far this passage had originally a Messianic meaning is discussed in my essay in the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* viii. pp. 1–41.

[3] According to the Greek pronunciation Χωχεβάς.

[4] Like the above Ariston of Pella (in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 6) who had apparently personally had a close view of

after his speedy fall many of his disappointed followers wittily changed this more than royal designation into the like sounding one *Bar-Koziba*, i.e. Son of a Liar, and this name immediately found its way into a good many books.[1] It is certain that Akîba gladly acknowledged him and contributed most to his being very widely acknowledged; but it is likewise certain that many a Rabbi did not from the first quite readily concur, and even disapproved of Akîba's confidence.[2] But the man claimed to give miraculous proofs that he was the promised Messiah, of which later writers tell ridiculous stories.[3] So terribly was the rejection of the true Messiah now avenged that in the same people such a magician could arise and meet with general credence.

Nevertheless, at first, during the summer and winter 132–133, the new kingdom seemed successful in everything; and it is surprising to see what enthusiasm, unanimity, and force once more animate the members of the Ancient Community when they seemed already quite scattered and sent adrift. We possess, indeed, no specific reminiscence of this, but the few scattered facts, the recollection of which has been preserved, speak plainly enough. It was as if the tide of enthusiasm that had been kept back so long and with such difficulty since the former terrible humiliations now burst forth with greater force, and the joy of at last forming one single great community in the Holy Land itself suddenly called, as by magic, a fresh great nation into being in that country. How artfully everything had long been prepared is seen from the fact that, though the Judean armourers manufactured the quantity of weapons ordered of them by the Roman governor, they yet made them purposely wrong, so that the Romans would not take them, whilst they could easily use them for Judean purposes after they had been altered. Moreover, the Judeans withdrew on all sides at first to caves and other secretly constructed refuges, but afterwards suddenly seized 985 villages and more than 50 fortified places.[4]

If, however, Bar-Kôkheba wished to ensure his power for

the whole kingdom; concerning this man, who was one of the earliest Christian historians, comp. what is collected in Langlois' *Collections des historiens de l'Arménie*, i. pp. 391 sq.

[1] As in the above *Sîder 'Olam rabba*, cap. 30, and the other Jewish writings.

[2] 'The grass will grow from thy chin before the Son of David (the Messiah) comes,' the more prudent R. Jochanan the son of Thôrtha is said once to have exclaimed (*Jer.* Taanîth, fol. 68. 4); but this was now no longer of any use.

[3] As that he wanted to imitate artificially the prophecy Isa. xi. 4 of the breath of the mouth of the Messiah that should slay the wicked, as Jerome (*Opp.* ii. p. 559 ed. Vall.) reports; a reminiscence of such jugglery has also been preserved in *Chron. Sam.* cap. 47, p. 239, in the narrative of the sieges of Jericho and Lydda.

[4] This according to Cassius Dio, lxix. 13 sq.

any length of time, it behoved him to place himself in as good a relation as possible with the neighbouring non-Judean nations, and according to all indications he was not wanting in this respect. The Judeans did not now begin by barbarously falling on and massacring the Heathen, especially not the Romans, as they had done in the years 115–17;[1] on this point they had learned something from the terrible issue of those struggles. They now preferred to try and win the foreigners over by kindness, entered into friendly relations with the Samaritans,[2] and spared the weaker Romans and Greeks. Nor did this prudent conduct remain unrewarded. Akîba's efforts had evidently long had as their object that many of the rich Judeans should assemble from foreign lands, that Palestine might now if possible become the place of meeting of all brave or otherwise distinguished Judeans; but while such Judeans thus flocked together their riches brought many Heathen in their train, and whilst the conversion of the latter was again being successfully carried on,[3] many found it also to their material advantage to join and assist the Judeans.[4] But, above all, the Judeans now succeeded in involving the Samaritans in the war;[5] as something similar had already happened in the last war,[6] the hatred of the Samaritans towards the Roman Government might now be the more widely spread and the more enduring if that prohibition of circumcision was made to apply to them also. But, on the other hand, the new prince of the Holy Land demanded the most complete submission and renunciation of Christianity from the Christians of every kind whom he could get within his power, made use of the most cruel punishments against them, as if they were simply apostates, and had many executed, especially when they refused to fight against the Romans.[7] From this we can with special clearness see the essential nature of this conspiracy; and it cannot be doubted that if Bar-Kôkheba had conquered, Christianity would have been completely eradicated by him as far as his human will could do it.

[1] *Ante*, pp. 271 sq.

[2] The chief seat of this war, Baethter (see below), was situated in Samaritan territory.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 267 sq.

[4] According to the indications in Cassius Dio, lxix. 13.

[5] This follows in general certainly enough from the reminiscences in the *Chron. Sam.* cap. 47, of which we shall speak below; Hadrian's memory was consequently bitterly cursed by Samaritans afterwards, and, as we see (*ibid.* p. 243), they even remembered that the Romans at that time had said, 'Let us kill *everyone who is circumcised!*' Yet we cannot be surprised that at last a Samaritan was the great traitor.

[6] Vol. vii. p. 547.

[7] According to Justin (*Apol.* i. 31, *Dial. c. Tryph.* cap. 1), the best authority on this point, as in his youth he might see everything at the place itself; Orosius, *Hist.* vii. 13, and other unimpeachable authorities.

The object was simply to restore the Hagiocracy, as the Rabbis conceived it, by means of force, according to the letter of the Pentateuch, and, in consequence of the greater pressure of the time, to do it with much greater harshness and severity than seventy years before.

At first the Romans despised this agitation among the 'slaves,' as they were now very generally wont to call the miserable remnant of the ancient nation after it had lost almost all its rights by Vespasian's and then by Trajan's persecutions. But they were soon compelled to feel that not only was all Palestine in a state of the most violent commotion, but also that in all other countries the Judeans were becoming more and more turbulent, and that this convulsion would soon spread through the whole Roman world; and already many Romans were deeply outraged by some secret or open act of malice. The loyalty of all Syria became uncertain, as many Heathen joined the movement; and since Hadrian was known to be a physically weak man, Bar-Kôkheba spread the report that he was a leper,[1] as if it could be of any use to fling back upon Cæsar, the friend of the Egyptians, that reproach which at the beginning of all this long history the Egyptians had cast upon the Israelites![2] Thus Hadrian was compelled to take the most severe measures for the suppression of the strife that had openly broken out, although he had always loved peace, and entered upon this war only with great reluctance. As the Roman governor of Palestine[3] had shown himself too weak, he sent in haste the best Roman generals to Palestine, and at last even had recourse to the governor of Britain, Julius Severus, who was considered the most capable, and finally, when the war grew ever more terrible and had lasted through fully two years and a half, himself repaired to the neighbourhood of

[1] Both facts according to Ariston of Pella in Moses of Chorene's *Hist.* ii. 57: but the latter author mentions Mesopotamia and Persia also, which could only refer to the Judeans living there.

[2] See vol. ii. pp. 76 sq.

[3] According to Rabbinical sources (e.g. Gemara to Aboda zara, i. 8, to Taanith, iv. 6, fol. 29 *a*) he was called טורנוס רופוס, and also Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 6 calls him simply Rufus. But Terentius Rufus was the name of the man who at the command of Titus raised the first Roman fortified station on the ruins of Jerusalem (vol. vii. p. 608), and whose name therefore naturally remained indelibly impressed upon the memory of the Judeans: hence when the Rabbis relate that, according to Roman custom, he had the plough drawn over the hill on which the Temple stood as a place never more to be inhabited, but for ever destined to lie waste, we might suspect a confusion had arisen with Terentius Rufus. But if we compare the true reading in Jerome, *Opp.* vi. p. 852 (where Vallarsius makes an alteration without manuscript authority) with the somewhat corrupt readings of the *Chronicon* according to Euseb. ii. p. 284 and Jerome p. 709, we should rather suppose that the name of Hadrian's governor was *Titus Annius Rufi filius*; the טורנוס of the Rabbis seems therefore to have rather been a nickname *Tyrannus*.

the scene of operations,[1] in order thence to give all needful instructions.

Thus the war became on the part of the rebels a real life and death struggle, into which all Judeans who would remain loyal to their faith threw themselves with the clear discernment that if the victory were not at length won the final ruin of the Judean cause would be unavoidable. It was a struggle, therefore, in which they once more fought with the utmost bravery and contempt for death, and at the same time with a unanimity, prudence, and discipline that would have been worthy of a better leader than Bar-Kôkheba. Whilst the warriors threw themselves into the thickest of the fight, unarmed men, on whose holy life the whole nation looked with unwavering confidence, fell on their knees in prayer[2] on eminences visible far and wide, and the soldiers fought with double strength at the sight of those who were to them the substitute for the as yet unrecovered visible Sanctuary. With what obstinacy the Judeans fought may be seen from the fact alone that this time they gained possession in Jerusalem of the hill only on which the Temple had stood, and of this but for a short time. For we may consider as certain this fact, which at first sight seems strange, but can easily be explained from the circumstances of the time;[3] for since Jerusalem had only just been changed into a new Heathen town by the command of the emperors, the Romans must have been able from the beginning to defend it more easily; and similarly in the wars of the Maccabees[4] the Judeans were for many years not in possession of Jerusalem, or only of a portion of it. If therefore this strong fortress, and at the same time this holy ground that fired their highest enthusiasm were to so small an extent in their power, we must still more admire the courage with which for three and a half

[1] We can conclude this at least with the greatest probability from the style of the letter which Hadrian, according to Cassius Dio, lxix. 14, sent to the Senate after making an end of the war.

[2] Evidently in imitation of Ex. xvii. 11.

[3] The two oldest historians, Ariston of Pella and Cassius Dio, are quite silent about a siege and capture of Jerusalem; the *Chron. Sam.* cap. 47 does indeed make it the basis of its narrative, but as it has nothing more to say about Baethter, Jerusalem has been certainly substituted for that town. As, therefore, Eusebius mentions Jerusalem neither in his *Chron.* nor *Ecc. Hist.*, we might go so far as to doubt whether Bar-Kôkheba occupied it even partially or only for a short time. But all these accounts are too brief for us to prove this from them; it can only be inferred from them that Jerusalem did not play the same prominent part in this war as it did in that of Vespasian. But a capture of Jerusalem by Hadrian's army is spoken of by *Appian* in the *Syriaca*, cap. 50, and Jerome, *Opp.* (ed. Vall.) iv. p. 975; v. p. 277, 696; vi. p. 852, not to mention Chrysostom, whose words are quoted by *Suidas* under βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως; and the coins of which we shall speak hereafter confirm this statement. The above hypothesis is therefore the safest one.

[4] Vol. v. pp. 311 sq.

years they once more set at defiance the supremacy and power of Rome.

But a detailed account of the course of this really final Judean war cannot now be furnished, as the Heathen and Christian historians describe only the last issue of the terrible struggle somewhat more in detail, and on the other hand the reminiscences of it which have been preserved in later Judean writings are partly too fragmentary, partly too legendary, to be brought into a clear connected narrative.[1] What the Samaritans tell about this war in later writings is, with the exception of a few real reminiscences, which are distinct from the rest, very confused and meaningless, and rather resembles a poetical revival of old disconnected legends.[2]

Nevertheless we can still plainly perceive that the struggle raged with equal fury through all parts of the country and caused such devastations as no former war had done. Judea, or the southern part of the country, was now for the first time laid so utterly waste that Jerusalem, just restored as a Heathen city, alone was somewhat more populous in the midst of a wide desert.[3] Galilee had during the last decades grown more and more in point of population in proportion as the hope of a new Judean Jerusalem waned; Judean learning, which had formerly clung closely to Judea's more sacred ground, had now migrated to Galilee,[4] and Akîba, who had formerly taught in Benæ-Beraq,[5] set up his school now in the Galilean town Usha.[6] But only the more completely was Galilee also now laid waste. The Samaritans, too, always recalled the devastations of this time only with horror.[7] The descriptions in the later Judean

[1] They are given most fully in Jer. Gem. to Taanith, iv. 6, fol. 68. 4 sq. and in the Midrash Ækha Rabbathi (to Lam. ii. 2), fol. 52, Amsterdam, as if from a single source. But we do not find in them even so connected an account as in the *Chron. Sam.* If it is wished to see to what an utter disregard of history the story of this struggle advanced in the Middle Ages, the book עֵמֶק הַבָּכָא of R. Joseph ha-Kohen (transl. by M. Wiener, Hanover, 1858) should be read *ad init.*

[2] At present we have this Samaritan story complete only in the *Chron. Sam.* cap. 47; in this the reminiscences of the war under Vespasian and of the resettlement of Sichem as Flavia Neapolis (*ante*, p. 82) are already quite mixed up with those of this wa and the two are worked up together; for instead of سقرس, p. 243, 1, must without doubt be read فلابيوس, i.e. *Flavius.* The same confusion appears in Abulfatch's *Ann.*, where, p. 113, 4–117, 13, one of Hadrian's wars is first spoken of, afterwards, p. 118, 5–7, a different one: the former of these narratives points rather to the war with Vespasian by the story of the arrow shot into the enemy's camp bearing a letter, see *ante*, p. 33.

[3] As Cassius Dio, lxix. 14, expressly states.

[4] *Ante*, p. 276.

[5] Mentioned *ante*, p. 45.

[6] According to the most recent inquiries the now ruinous Hûsheh, south of Shefa 'Amar; and north of it, north-east of 'Akkô, the modern Jâsif probably corresponds to ياسوف, *Chron. Sam.* cap. xlvii. p. 237 sq.

[7] *Chron. Sam.* cap. 47, p. 243 sq.

writings of the rivers of blood, of the barbarous treachery everywhere committed by 'Hadrian,' and similar things, are besides sufficiently horrible, but at the same time so completely unhistorical, and especially so greatly vitiated by the continual confusion of Hadrian, Trajan, and Vespasian, as well as of the events of their several times, that we cannot use them as historical sources. The following is therefore all that under these circumstances can be said of the detailed course of the war.

It is certain that the Romans, being at first led by incapable leaders, met with many reverses and suffered great losses.[1] Julius Severus, the greatest general of the time, who, like Vespasian before him, had been summoned from remote Britain, considered it therefore most prudent not at present to provoke the insurgents, who in large bodies commanded almost the whole country, to a great pitched battle; he tried to crush detachments separately by a superior force of the best Roman soldiers, or to drive them back completely into their caves and other hiding-places, there to conquer them slowly, but all the more surely, by famine and similar hardships, and thus in the end completely to overpower them. The insurgents did not hold Jerusalem itself, or rather the Temple hill, through even the whole of the *first year of liberty*, of which they boasted on their hastily struck coins;[2] still less could they at this time think of any restoration of the Temple.[3] After the fall of Jerusalem the Romans succeeded so soon in occupying the other fortified places that all the insurgents who were still vigorous were compelled to retire with Bar-Kôkheba into a single fortress, on the successful defence or conquest of which the whole issue of the war thenceforth depended, for the possession of which they may really have fought for more than a year, and which had till then in the long history of the wars of the people of Israel been almost unknown; so that the peculiar character of this last great war is apparent from it alone. This fortress was

[1] The briefest but best authority for this is Fronto's now rediscovered *De bello Parthico* in Mai's edition of his works (Rome, 1823), p. 200. The inscription in honour of a Q. Lollius Quirina Urbicus *legatus Imp. Hadriani in expeditione Judaica* qua donatus est hasta pura corona aurea rel. is contained in the *Annuaire de Constantine*, i. p. 85, comp. 88.

[2] The investigation of these coins, which are preserved in tolerably large numbers, shows that the name ירושלם is found upon most of those of the first year only, on all others ישראל is used instead: from which we can easily infer that during the second half of the first and during the second year Jerusalem was already lost, especially when we consider that the coins from the time of the insurrection against Nero do not exhibit such a change.

[3] Instead of the representation of a temple that of a mere temple gate is found upon some of the coins, as if the hope merely were expressed of a temple soon to be erected.

Bithtér, or more correctly Baeth-tér,[1] and was situated almost on the direct road from Cæsarea to the ancient Samaria, south-east of Cæsarea, and not far from the sea. We no longer know definitely why this place in the neighbourhood of the sea and the strong fortress of Cæsarea was selected by Bar-Kôkheba for his most secure place of arms; but Cæsarea appears to have lain half in ruins,[2] and it was a great advantage for many purposes to command the road by the sea; and we have seen[3] that Herod had built the strongly fortified city Antipatris not far to the south of it. The place must have been very rapidly fortified with unusual strength, and subterranean passages and hiding-places were carried beneath it (provisions which the Judeans appear to have once more highly valued); and all the later reminiscences plainly indicate that a vast number of Judeans dwelt there at this time, either as soldiers or otherwise occupied.

The Romans must have first completely put down the Samaritans; but the latter, in conformity with their traditional habit, then readily turned against the Judeans; and we can still plainly enough perceive that the Samaritans came out of this war with new favour from the Romans.[4] Indeed, according to Jewish tradition, it was a crafty Samaritan who, aided by the folly of Bar-Kôkheba, hastened the ultimate fall of the fortress which had so long been most bravely defended. The fate of the

[1] ביתתר, Jer. Gem. to Taanith, fol. 68. 4, 69. 1; Βίθθηρα in Ariston of Pella, in the oldest passage that has been preserved in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 6: the most exact orthography is certainly Baeth-*tér*, בֵּית תֵּר, although even the Rabbis usually wrote more briefly ביתר or even בתר (*M.* Taanith, iv. 6; Challa, iv. 10): but as it was also pronounced *Batarum* (*Itinerarium Hierosolym.* pp. 588, 600, ed. Wess. *Itiner. Provinciarum*, pp. 150, 199. Itiner. Burdig. in the *Revue Archéol.* 1864, Aug. pp. 104, 107), it became the modern name *Bârîn*. The most cogent argument for this position of the fortress is that of all that the Judean sources state about it nothing can be more authentic than that it lay not far from the sea; the words in Eusebius, however, *τῶν Ἱεροσυλύμων οὐ σφόδρα πόρρω διεστῶσα*, need not be taken too rigidly, as it would still lie considerably nearer than Cæsarea. In the Middle Ages this site was still remembered, see Carmoly's *Itinéraires*, p. 252; also Obadja's *Reisen*, ed. Neubauer, p. 27 (67). We might also be tempted to think of the *Bittîr* somewhat south-west of Jerusalem, which corresponds to the Βαιθηρ, Ixx. Alex. Jos. xv. 59 (in a passage, not in the Hebrew text, containing eleven names of towns), and Βηθθηρ in an addition of Ixx. Alex. to 1 Chron. vi. 39 (59). as at the present day the Wâdi Bittîr has its name from it; further west is the Wâdi el Rumâni, which might correspond to the Valley of Baeth-Rimmôn, where, according to the Berêshîth rabba, cap. lxiv. the Judeans assembled; the country too is mountainous and appears better suited for fighting. But this site is certainly not intended if we are to find anything historical in those Rabbinical reminiscences of the neighbourhood of the sea (comp. the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* x. p. 163). Still less can we think of Baethel with Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, iii. p. 270, ed. 2. On the situation of Bæthter comp. further *Götting. Gel. Anz.* 1868, pp. 2031 sq.

[2] *Ante*, p. 282.

[3] Vol. v. p. 435.

[4] On some coins of *Flavia Neapolis Syr. Pal.* of the reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius in Mionnet's *Description des Méd.* v. pp. 500, 505 sq. and *Suppl.* viii. 346, pl. xviii. the Temple of Gerizim appears in full splendour; an account of the building of this Temple occurs in Abulfatch's *Ann.* pp. 166. 9–168. 17.

fortress appeared at length to depend on the two slender threads of the life of Bar-Kôkheba and that of the Rabbi Eleazar of Modin,[1] who was revered by all the combatants as a sacred being, and who lay continually in prayer on a spot visible to all the soldiers. According to all appearances this Eleazar was from the beginning of the entire rebellion a man greatly respected.[2] At that juncture (the tradition ran) the above-mentioned crafty Samaritan stealthily approached the praying hero, pretended that he had business with him, and afterwards persuaded Bar-Kôkheba, by his cunning simulations, that the devout man was about to betray the fortress to the enemy: this the infatuated Son of Heaven is said to have believed, and in consequence killed the innocent man, losing thereby suddenly the confidence of the nation completely. Thus, it was said, he fell disgracefully, and immediately afterwards the fortress; but the more blindly the confidence of the people had been accorded to him, the greater must their resentment have been when they discovered that they had been deceived, and with proportionally black colours later generations describe his death.[3] Two brothers, who then endeavoured to make a stand at Kephar-Charôba, were quickly destroyed.[4] According to Roman estimates, 580,000 men fell during the entire war by the Roman sword alone,[5] and the loss of the Romans was so great that it could not afterwards be forgotten that when Hadrian announced the termination of the war he omitted at the beginning of his letter the customary phrase, 'I and my army are well.' He also omitted to institute a triumphal entry into Rome, especially as from his disposition he attached no value to such displays, and to triumph over 'slaves'

[1] The former hereditary seat of the Asmoneans, vol. v. p. 307; and in this region of Baethter his grave was in the Middle Ages still shown, see Carmoly's *Itinéraires*, p. 253.

[2] We may even maintain that the recently discovered coins of 'the first year of Freedom' with the further inscription 'Eleazar the Priest' (published by Vogué, *Revue numismatique*, 1860, pp. 280–92) were from him, and that it was not until a later period that he was gradually pushed into the background by Bar-Kôkheba and ultimately put to death.

[3] For instance, a serpent coiled itself round his body, &c. It is only a legend probably that the fortress fell on August 9, as later Jewish traditions say, and the origin of the legend is to be sought in the association of the annual mourning for this final Roman victory with that for the fall of the Temple, comp. vol. vii. p. 606; for the very earliest passage, *M.* Taanith, iv. 6, sufficiently shows the legendary character of these dates; to which must be added that in the *Sêder 'Olam*, cap. 30, August 17 is supposed to be the date of the destruction of the second Temple, and Bither is not referred to at all.

[4] The account in Aekha Rabbathi, fol. 52. 3, is very short: the place is probably Χαραβή, or according to another reading Ἀχαβάρα, Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 6 *Vita*, § 37, in Upper Galilee.

[5] Cassius Dio, lxix. 14. Statements to be met with in very disconnected remarks as to the way in which the numerous slaves were sold, that great numbers of them were carried into Egypt or perished on the way of hunger or shipwreck, cannot be made to yield distinct historical information, see *Chron. Pasch.* i. p. 474, where everything is referred back to the year 119, Glykas' *Ann.* iii. p. 448.

was of itself not very glorious. Yet he accorded to the 'Judean army' a mark of honour.[1]

The immediate and more remote Consequences of this War as regards the Judeans themselves.

Among the remnants of the nation itself the view was ever after justly perpetuated, that of the three great Roman wars which it had endured during the last seventy years, each succeeding one had been worse than the one before. After the first, it was said, the Rabbis had prohibited wearing bridegrooms' wreaths[2] and beating drums on wedding days; after the second, wearing brides' wreaths and learning Greek in the schools; after the third, the carrying round of nuptial sedans.[3] The last war was called simply *the war of extermination*.[4] As a fact the immediate result of the Roman victory was that those laws of Trajan which they had refused to submit to were reimposed by Hadrian with greater stringency, and still worse ones were added to them. It was determined to thoroughly overcome their defiance both as a nation and a religious community, and the ancient Roman rigour in the extermination of a persistently rebellious nation was revived again under Hadrian with such terrible force that this otherwise mild and peace-loving prince cannot in this case be recognised. And it must be allowed that past history contained no instance of a nation which, when the smallness of its numbers and its wide dispersion were taken into account, had rendered such an obstinate resistance to the Romans, and a resistance which was to them so unintelligible and mysterious, as this nation which had for nearly seventy years been most deeply humiliated and apparently exterminated.

Circumcision was accordingly afresh prohibited, and also every meeting for the observance of the Sabbath and the feasts. And as the Romans had then probably perceived that the last war had been kindled by the Rabbis alone, anyone who should assume the office of a Rabbinical teacher, or consecrate others to that office by the imposition of hands,[5] was to be most severely punished, and in some circumstances even with death.[6]

[1] Of which Hadrian granted a number to the armies of various provinces, see Greppo, pp. 92, 181 sq., 189.

[2] Which were still customary in accordance with the ancient practice, *Cant.* iii. 11.

[3] *M.* Sota, ix. 14: the three wars are here distinguished as in the passage explained, *ante*, p. 282.

[4] הַשְׁמָד, or shorter still שְׁמָד.

[5] *Ante*, p 31.

[6] The execution of Akiba and others is related in the modern *Midrash elle ezkera* or *of the ten martyrs* (in Jellinek's *Bet ha-Midrash*, ii. pp. 64–72, comp. Zunz's *Synagogale Poesie*, pp. 139–144, 473 sq.) in a diffuse and florid manner

It was upon these Rabbis that the concentrated indignation of the Romans descended, and during those years many of them, beyond doubt, fell as victims, having been either seized during the rebellion or afterwards surprised in their official duties. Akîba was not executed until now, and in the last moment of his torture he steadfastly repeated aloud his Judean confession of faith. It is true the later accounts describe such punishments as these with so much bitterness and exaggeration that the most we learn from them is the fierce hatred which runs through them; but it cannot be doubted that these most grievous laws that had ever been imposed on the nation were carried out with the most merciless severity until after the death of Hadrian in the year 138.

Jerusalem itself was now completely rebuilt as a purely Roman and Heathen city, adorned with a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus and other Heathen temples, and dedicated by Hadrian on the celebration of the twentieth year of his reign, A.D. 137, as *Colonia Ælia Capitolina* (generally abbreviated to Ælia), after the deity and his own name, and all Judeans were strictly forbidden by Hadrian to enter or even approach it.[1] The Temple hill, however, was left outside the city, and was to remain ploughed land,[2] which accords with what was said above.[3] And as if all these new buildings and new names, which were meant to blot out all memory of the ancient sanctuary, and even its very name, were not enough to forbid the Judeans, with their Law, all approach to it, the Emperor added the insult of placing the image of a swine over the gate leading to Bethlehem.[4] We recognise in this the stale wit of

after the shorter early reminiscences, but everything is so completely unhistorical and so poor as invention that it is very difficult to find even the smallest matter that can be used for historical purposes. *Chanîna Ben Turdian*, who is mentioned, *M.* Taanith, ii. 5, and elsewhere in connection with Akîba, lived according to this account in Rome; his father's name, טרדיון, which is now usually pronounced Teradjon, without any meaning, and which, with little doubt, must be derived in the form *Turdianus* from the Roman *Turdus*, points also to Rome.

[1] As Ariston of Pella relates, Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 6. We have not the text of Hadrian's law, and therefore do not know to what extent the country outside Jerusalem was also prohibited to them; but the language of Ariston points to the whole of Judea, and this is manifestly implied also in Justin's language, *Apol.* i. cap. 47, *Dial. c. Tryp.* cap. 16, who had the best information on this point. It might be inferred from Jerome, *Chron.* p. 712, inasmuch as the naming of it falls in the year 138, that Hadrian dedicated and legalised the name Ælia on the *vicennalia imperii*.

[2] This follows from the account, referred to above, p. 286, of the ploughing of the Temple hill; and a coin of Ælia alludes by a representation to this.

[3] *Ante*, p. 287.

[4] Hieron. *Chron.* p. 712. The further description of Jerusalem as thus converted into a Heathen city does not concern us. It is, however, remarkable that Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacra*, ii. 31, relates that Hadrian desired with his new buildings in Jerusalem (and as Jerome, *Epist.* 58 *ad Paulinum* adds, in Bethlehem also, where a temple to Adonis was built) to injure Christians likewise, as in a similar

the Emperor, who wished to show his learning. Further, the temple-tax, which the Judeans were compelled from the time of Vespasian to pay to Jupiter,[1] was now converted into a kind of body-tax, as if all the Judeans throughout the empire were nothing but servile dependents.

There were in these regulations of Hadrian some things which could undoubtedly be carried out for the moment with merciless rigour, but it was impossible that they could long remain in force, because they were intended not to exterminate the Judeans simply as members of a nation and confessors of a religion, but as men also, and were regulations against which therefore they must complain and, whenever it was possible, rebel as long as any human feeling remained in them. Accordingly, in spite of all these most terrible inflictions that could fall upon the members of a nation or a religious community, we meet with a fresh Judean rebellion during the reign of Antoninus Pius, of which we know no more than that it had to be put down once more without mercy.[2] This successor of Hadrian, however, rescinded the most oppressive of Hadrian's regulations, though it may have been probably only in consequence of these fresh troubles, which seriously disturbed the peace of the empire. He permitted circumcision again, religious meetings and schools, as well as lamentation at the foot of the Temple hill in Jerusalem itself over the loss of the Temple at least one day every year. But in reality the Romans regarded all the Judeans scattered throughout the empire as men without freedom, whose lives and movable property were secure only on the most oppressive and humiliating conditions, and whose peculiar faith was tolerated only so far as it and the institutions and usages connected with it were not opposed to the supreme will of the Roman empire and its laws. Vespasian's mode of treating the Judeans seventy years before was now fully adopted, and adopted permanently; and the history of these seventy years, with all their sufferings and struggles, ultimately served merely to prove this beyond dispute. The Judeans, as far as they had been a nation—or had at all events down to this time borne the semblance of one—became henceforth more unfortunate and more without rights than any other nation; for the Egyptians, the Syrians, the remnants of the ancient Phœnicians, for

way he relates, cap. 30, that Titus determined to destroy the Temple on account of the Christians also. But it was not until Constantine's day that these two suppositions could be made and treated as history: at all events, we have no earlier authority for either, comp. vol. vii. p. 605.

[1] *Ante*, p. 260.

[2] *Judæos rebellantes contudit* (Antoninus Pius) *per præsides et legatos* is the statement of Jul. Capitolinus in his *Vita*, cap. 5.

instance, much as they had lost their independent existence under the Roman domination, retained, at all events, their ancient native country with its sacred temples. In the case of the Judeans all the above regulations were kept in force by the Romans to such an extent, in spite of numerous subsequent rebellions [1] and some vacillation at times on the part of the rulers, that even another Bar-Kôkheba became hereafter quite impossible. And in the Parthian empire the Judeans had long had no better position after their last rebellions there had met with such a miserable end; [2] and even their common representative in relation to the government, or the so-called Prince, whom they at times succeeded in gaining there, and to whom they submitted for the sake of union amongst themselves,[3] was absolutely dependent always on the goodwill and toleration of the king.

We can well understand why the remnants of the Ancient Community should not be converted to Heathenism by these unalterable and extreme limitations imposed upon them by Heathen governments. But that this community cut itself off more and more completely from the Christian Church, as with the unalterable feeling that since Christianity had entered the world its own history had been continually more calamitous and the alienation between the two communities had increased, was very much the work of its Rabbis. In their infatuated perpetuation of the degenerate Hagiocracy they had simply declined to resign their own rule over men's minds, and refused themselves to seek a correct acquaintance with Christianity or to permit their adherents to form a true estimate of it. The schools, therefore, now became more rigidly scrupulous; hatred of Christianity and Christians, particularly the bishops, more unreasonable; [4] and though Israel still lived on, in scattered remnants, as a corporate whole it had been overtaken by the paralysis of death. But only to a very limited extent had the

[1] Thus as late as 199 A.D., in the reign of Severus, in consequence again of a Parthian and Arabian war, a Judeo-Samaritan war was also waged and a *triumphus* decreed by the Senate: we learn this from Spartianus, *Vita Severi Imp.* capp. xvi. sq. and the *Chronicon* of Jerome, *Opp.* viii. p. 733, but can form no idea of the details.

[2] Vol. vii. p. 523.

[3] Called Rêsh-Gâlûtha, i.e. Head of the Exiles, comp. vol. vi. p. 84.

[4] We may see from Peter's letter to James prefixed to Clem. *Hom.* cap. i. how rigorous the schools became; from Just. *Dial. c. Tryp.* capp. 16, 47; Epiphan. *Hær.* xxix. 9; and from the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, capp. 12–18, which is historical, how fierce the hatred of Christians; and the Talmud is in essential agreement with these authorities. We may see from the Talmudic tract, *Aboda Zara*, and numerous other Talmudic regulations plainly enough, and to the horror of intelligent minds, how rigid was the separation from Christianity especially which the Rabbis now carried out to its utmost consequences.

whole ancient nation become a Rabbinical community, i.e. a school; and only in this form could the Ancient Community still perpetuate its existence as far as the sovereignty of the 'Nations' allowed it.

This is therefore the necessary and true end of the history of Israel as far as its nationality is concerned; for the Roman Government, even at the beginning of its own gradual decay and disintegration, only did what every other power must have done in similar circumstances, because the most intricate knot in which the history of Israel as a nation had now for almost 700 years been ever more hopelessly involved, could simply be violently cut. The delusion of a Hagiocracy to be formed by the people of Israel upon the basis of its sacred writings, which were no longer rightly understood by the nation itself, must at last be quite dispelled, after it had been for nearly 700 years developed ever more distinctly, and at each crisis had only become more and more fatal. If the sovereignty over the world, which properly belongs to the true religion, and which this religion must hold fast at least as its hope, is identical with the Hagiocracy as it may exist, and then existed, in a single people (or class) on the basis of misunderstood sacred writings, then an interminable and deadly struggle ensues between such a Hagiocracy and every opposing power; a struggle in which it must either conquer or itself sooner or later perish, because its pretensions are so lofty and apparently so sacred that no other power may exist side by side with it as long as it can assert its claims. The case of the Papacy is essentially the same, and the history of each of the two powers explains that of the other. Both sprang up in disordered and troubled times; both appealed to the sacred Scriptures and other traditions which they did not rightly understand, and when higher truth inconvenienced them purposely refused rightly to understand them; both made substantially the same pretensions, and they were such that no other spiritual or worldly power could exist side by side with them if it would not submit to them; and it was only because the Hagiocracy of the Old Testament was from the beginning forced to work in a much narrower sphere, in which it early enough came into collision with what was perfect in its own province but yet had not sprung from it, that its history was comparatively much shorter, and now lies before us completed in those ancient times, and is thus all the more instructive.

As soon as the Hagiocracy had emerged from the confusion of the time in a more developed and invigorated form, it came into collision with the Syro-Egyptian empire and the glare of

secular science and art which was reflected by that power. It had then to defend the existence of the true religion in its purity and inviolability against the seductive splendour of Heathenism, and did thus defend it with its own best and noblest resources. In doing this it rapidly obtained its greatest glory, whilst the Syro-Egyptian empire was more and more shaken, by this conflict partly, and in the end was the first to disappear from the scene. But through these successes the Hagiocracy simply succumbed the more quickly to the development of its own great errors. Thus it soon rose up against every other supremacy; against that of the Asmoneans, which proceeded from its own bosom, and undermined it; against the more powerful but semi-Roman government of the Herods, to which it was from the commencement opposed, and in the weakening of which it was indefatigably employed; and, lastly, against that of the Romans. But before it had gradually involved itself in direct conflict with this world-wide empire it had alienated many of the noblest sections of its own countrymen, and, above all, had nailed to the cross Him who alone brought true help, and whose Spirit and Church, which were springing so marvellously from its own midst, it could not destroy. Thus its final conflicts with the Roman empire were more than ever dark and desperate, destructive and conclusive; and it was reserved for the most powerful of all Heathen nations, which was permitted to punish so many other nations with an older and higher civilisation for all their earlier sins and errors, as in a final judgment, to exterminate this nation of unique character whose errors and transgressions had necessarily to be far more profoundly and thoroughly punished than those of any other people. In the case before us we have but the final and greatest instance of this.

For if now, at the end of the third and final epoch of the entire history of this nation, we once more look back to the issues of each of its previous epochs in this dark aspect of them, we can easily see that with each of them the accomplishment of the task proposed to this nation became more difficult, and also that as the task in each case was not properly performed both the confusion and the punishment grew continually more serious. The error involved in the rigid Theocracy, which was the characteristic form of the first epoch, was serious, and was rigorously punished. But it was the error of youthful exaggeration, was recognised by the nation itself before it was too late, and by the glad co-operation of all sections was remedied in the right way. When by this happy abandonment of an error the prosperity

and general elevation of the nation in the second epoch of its history were widely developed, insensibly the dualism and possible internal dissension between the Basileocracy and the Theocracy grew into a far more serious and inexcusable conflict, which involved no smaller punishment than the ruin of this powerful nation itself. At the same time the task before the nation was necessarily more than ever, by the search for and establishment of the perfect true religion, to wholly break down the merely national limitation. And if this turned out in actual experience to be too early, at all events the ancient truth and the new purified hope of the consummation of true religion generally amid the decline of earthly glory were rescued and secured, and from them there soon germinated a third great epoch of the history of the nation which, though externally diminished, still remained in its better nature sufficiently strong. But when in this third epoch the Hagiocracy arose out of the new straits of the time, simply because the true end of the development here secretly in progress could not be at once attained, a more serious punishment still was involved in its unfaithfulness. If after it had reached maturity it sought to maintain for itself the position of permanent supremacy; if it aroused against it every independent power; if it mortally persecuted and sought to exterminate the consummation of true religion generally which had necessarily to come, and actually came as the ultimate object of all development in this nation—then in this last and most serious error there was necessarily involved a Divine punishment such as had attended no previous error. The true punishment could in this instance be no other than the actual destruction, not merely of the external power and splendour of the nation as at the end of the previous epoch, but of its entire existence as 'the people of God.' The special error which supposes that it has on its side the greatness and the most glorious past of a nation, and further, as in this case, the eternal truth of religion with its sacred Scriptures, may grow and strengthen till it reaches infinitely serious proportions; and we have seen that such an error urged the largest and noblest portion of this nation into the most desperate conflicts. The ultimate exposure of the error is therefore all the more ruinous, and in this case it necessarily involved in its overthrow the entire nation as far as it had still an existence. But as the rise and the existence of this nation had a meaning and divine necessity only in opposition to Heathenism, and all its errors therefore were always punished by the Heathen alone, this its last and most fatal error had to be punished solely by them; and the ancient greatness and

wonderful nature of this one people, which formed such a perfect contrast to all the Heathen, appears once more at last in this, that, with all its growing earthly weakness, it could be actually exterminated only by the last and most powerful of all the nations of the ancient world. A nation or a community which is possessed by the fixed idea of being in sole possession of the true religion, and of being able to spread it according to its pleasure, while all the time it proves that it possesses it neither by its doctrines nor its deeds, deserves to be destroyed by the power of Heathenism. But we saw how painfully difficult it was to the Romans even thoroughly to eradicate this infatuated notion, or in any case to render it innocuous.

The vain hopes, whether Messianic or of another description, which had sustained the courage of the Judeans during these seventy years, and had attended them into the final desperate struggle, had now also vanished. We refer to such hopes as that the Lord would never forsake His people; that the second dispersion of the nation would, like the first, be temporary only; that some Messiah would deliver the nation as it then was, and the like. All the Messianic hopes, with their truth and their inspiring magnificence, necessarily became now either meaningless to the Ancient Community or were referred to an entirely indefinite future, even as regards the initial stages of their fulfilment; which was only another form of depriving them of all meaning.

And just as those members of the Ancient Community who sought to remain such still were now driven from public life into the darker obscurity of social existence, and remained there for the most part, so their religion and their practices, with their general view of human life and duty, gradually more and more found their home in a similar gloomy retirement. It is especially this timid retirement, this proud and yet anxious and pusillanimous separation, which proclaims the immediate death of Israel as a nation, and which is on the continual increase during the seven centuries of the Hagiocracy, until at last it reaches its climax. It began with the exclusion of the Samaritans;[1] made most rapid strides at the beginning of the Roman period, when the two schools of Hillel and Shammai, in other respects at variance, came to an agreement with regard to eighteen far-reaching prohibitions, increasing the rigour of the laws respecting unclean things;[2] and now reached its climax

[1] Vol. v. pp. 103 sq.

[2] On these eighteen prohibitions we have no detailed ancient authority, but they are always presupposed in the Talmud. To them belongs the prohibition of bread, oil, and wine belonging to the Heathen, which was in force, indeed, before the second destruction of Jerusalem, *ante*, p. 44.

in the complete dissolution of Israel, which determines to remain a nation, and neither is nor can be one. Respectful attention to the Græco-Roman language and science had [1] received a severe blow with the destruction of the Temple: [2] soon after the time before us it ceased entirely; and to the hatred of everything Christian, which even before this had become one of the characteristics of those Judeans who remained true to the Ancient Community, was now added, in a more developed form, an indefinite fear of all Heathen literature and of the secular science and art that it brought with it. More exclusively and convulsively than ever before did they now cling to the memory of the ancient glories of the nation. They adhered passionately both to the institutions of their ancestors as far as they could still be kept up, and to the ancient sacred books, as if moved by a vague recollection that in them the great prosperity and the blessing of their forefathers had lain, and that a similar or yet greater blessing might perhaps return by faithfulness to them; but the spirit that shrinks from every absolute truth and the examination of it, and the unhistorical and, consequently, superstitious habit of mind, soon made the most rapid progress. On the other hand, the life of a community which is barely tolerated in the State, and is debarred from taking part in great public affairs, can only too easily seduce the man who is not controlled by the full power and freedom of the perfect true religion to base self-seeking with all its ignoble endeavours. And accordingly in the present circumstances there was nothing else open to the Judeans than the possibility of sinking yet deeper into ruin; [3] so that at last any deliverance in this case must come from quite another quarter.

But the heaviest blow that could be dealt had also fallen upon the esteem in which the true religion had been held, to be considered the representatives of which before the world the Judeans had till now desired; and if the true religion had then existed on the earth in no other way or form than that in which the Judeans, misled by the phantom of a Hagiocracy, wished to retain it, its continuance would have become quite

[1] *Ante*, p. 44.

[2] Since the *last war*, *M.* Sôta, ix. 14, can only be that of Bar-Kôkheba, we must take the war with Titus, after which Greek was forbidden, literally; but even if the war with Quietus is intended instead (*ante*, p. 283), it follows that Greek was forbidden long before Bar-Kôkheba.

[3] The proof of all this does not belong to this work, but the historical proofs have been already clearly given, beginning with the Talmudic writings. It is equally true that from the continual degradation of the subjects of a State there must arise in the end the greatest misfortune for the State itself, as is also sufficiently proved by the history of the Jews: a Christian State must therefore take precautions against this in time.

doubtful, its truest champions who wished to compel the world to respect it would have been completely driven into obscurity, and, lastly, its community would have been for ever scattered and have sunk to some such condition as the Chaldeans or Isis-worshipping Egyptians, who also at one time travelled through many parts of the Roman empire teaching and founding communities. Even its Sacred Scriptures would then also finally have been lost, or at most preserved in as miserable fragments as are those of the Zarathustrians.

That a similar fate was in store for the Samaritan community also, and in fact a yet more speedy one, on account both of its limited territory and intellectual narrowness, has been already shown,[1] and is confirmed by its whole further history down to the present day.

The altered Position of Christianity.

We may therefore, at this point, perceive all the more clearly of what immeasurable value it was that, at this time, Christianity had already become completely independent, and could be easily separated from the Ancient Community from which it sprang, so that these terrible final storms which destroyed its own native home could no longer injure it. Christianity had appeared as the only proper consummation of the true religion that had been established in the Ancient Community. Hence, all that was really immortal in the old religion—in thought and spirit, in writing, in institutions and customs—had been transferred to it; and in it they had received their new and perfect life. All that was immortal in the Ancient Community had long been waiting for transfiguration and regeneration. This regenerated community existed now in reality and plainly before the eyes of all; it did not suffer too severely in the violent storms which, at the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple, shook the Ancient Community to its foundations; and it suffers still less from these last storms which totally destroyed the older one. For as Christianity in the Apostolic Age, even while hindered by its mother whose bosom it would not leave, developed in its own fashion more and more consciously and vigorously, whilst its parent became more and more unfeeling and blind towards her one true daughter, and hurried more irretrievably to her ruin; so during these last seventy years, when it had got quite free from her, it acquired the most complete independence and strength in the maturity of its own

[1] Vol. v. pp. 220 sq.

spirit; and gained, in the same degree, ever fresh confidence, and ever purer and loftier hope in proportion as its mother was for the second time miserably perishing in the snares of death which she had herself laid. And happily, although the Ancient Community, in the midst of the throes of her own dissolution, still cruelly persecuted her best child, the latter contributed in no way to her ruin, so that the New Community could, in this respect, go forth into the world with nothing on her conscience. Though, of course, it does not follow from this that Christians were obliged to bear in complete silence all the baseless calumnies which Judean and Heathen rivalled each other in casting upon them before Heathen governments. And we shall see immediately that there was a change in this respect before the end of our period.

For Christianity did not merely pass uninjured through these last storms, but as the young and tender verdure amid the storms of spring soon sends forth all the stronger shoots, so it gained by them. The last misconception as to the true nature of the Judeanism of the time was necessarily corrected in the view of all the world when this outbreak of wild despair was seen to be confined to the Judeans, and the execution of Christians by Bar-Kôkheba was witnessed;[1] and the Romans must have been much more inclined than they were formerly to treat Christians more leniently. Within the Christian Church itself, too, there was now accomplished, through these calamities, the last purification which was still required. We find it remarked in early Christian history as a matter of importance, which we can understand in these circumstances quite well, that the first Christian bishop in the new city Ælia was a Gentile Christian,[2] whilst in Jerusalem the custom had previously continued to be somewhat different.[3] A Christian parent church had therefore wholly ceased to exist. It is true the Jewish Christian churches were not at once everywhere dissolved, especially as not a few Judeans, who were tired of the course things had taken under Bar-Kôkheba and of the severe persecutions by the Heathen, might desire to go over to them; since Christians had, for the moment at all events, less to fear from Roman violence. Still, such hybrid societies could not now be kept up for long, and nothing had contributed more powerfully to the ultimate separation between the spirit and aims of the New and the Old Communities than this war of Bar-Kôkheba. Conversions of Heathen to Judeanism now cease

[1] *Ante*, p. 285.

[2] See Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 6 *ad fin.*

[3] *Ante*, p. 187.

practically altogether just as they had began for a time to be more frequent;[1] whilst conversions to Christianity more than ever increase from this time with sweeping rapidity. In full view of the horrors of the last war, and of the steadfast endurance of the tortures of death which Bar-Kôkheba inflicted upon Christians, Justin, of Neapolis, in Samaria, being a Heathen philosopher, became a Christian;[2] and then as a philosopher bravely defended Christianity, and sealed his faithfulness at last in Rome by the death of a martyr. And Justin's is only one instance accidentally known to us of a great number of similar cases. For after the complete overthrow of Judeanism the attention of all thoughtful Heathen was directed the more exclusively to Christianity, which was so closely related to, and yet so radically different from it; and it was particularly many philosophers who were now most powerfully attracted by Christianity.

This spirit of sound and daring confidence with which Christianity, as now thrust forth into the midst of Heathenism, confronts the whole world, impels it in our period openly to advocate its cause before all mankind, and even directly before the Emperor himself, to defend itself against the baseless accusations of both Judeans and Heathen, and to invoke the justice of the highest earthly tribunal. When Hadrian was staying for a time in Athens on one of his numerous journeys, Quadratus, the bishop of the Christian church there, presented to him publicly an apology for Christianity, which, according to the custom of the time, was immediately widely circulated and largely read, though now all but a short fragment of it has perished. It was presented some time before the outbreak of the last war.[3] A Christian philosopher, Aristeides, also presented to Hadrian an apology;[4] and thus these two men opened a course which was soon followed by others who were highly instructed both in secular learning and in Christian truth,

[1] *Ante*, p. 267.

[2] As Justin narrates all this of himself in such a simple and instructive way, *Apol.* ii. cap. 12, comp. *Apol.* i. cap. 31; these two passages explain each other as regards the circumstances of the time; and we meet here almost alone the freshest impressions of that period.

[3] According to Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 3, where the sole remaining fragment of the work is preserved; it follows from the remark of Dionysius, one of his successors, that he was bishop of Athens, iv. 23. 3, and it may be inferred from the book of the early writer Miltiades, v. 17, comp. iii. 37, that he flourished in the period immediately after the Apostles and was looked upon as a Christian prophet; for we are justified in supposing that the same Quadratus is meant in all these reminiscences. The exact date of the publication of his apology cannot be definitely fixed, as Hadrian was several times in Athens; but it appeared before the war in any case.

[4] That it was presented at the same time as Quadratus's does not follow necessarily from Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 3; whilst Jerome, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* capp. 19, 20, brings nothing new with regard to either of them.

for instance, the above-mentioned Justin, Melito,[1] bishop of Sardis, and others.

The Greek language, as the central product of the world of that time, became thus the first winged herald of the new salvation which had arisen upon the world. But in the East the Aramaic form of ancient Hebrew was all along the rival of Greek, and in the West soon followed no less enthusiastic and daring orations than those just mentioned, addressed to the unbelieving lords of the earth, as those of Minucius Felix,[2] notwithstanding their confused ideas of Demons. While, therefore, the remnants of the Ancient Community withdraw from the public life of the great world into their corners, in gloomy anger and with beclouded minds, Christianity comes for the first time into the full light of the world in order to defend its rights before the most powerful princes of the earth, and to render an open account of its aims and actions in the presence of the whole world. By this means Christianity had been already so securely established on the earth, and had so indissolubly interwoven itself with the general history of the world, that the earthly parent from whom it had sprung could now pass away without any injury to the great cause which it ought, but was no longer able, to protect. Thus the mortal has given place to the immortal and spiritual, as far as this can appear in the course and amidst the dust of advancing human history.

3. *The End of the entire History of Israel.*

In this respect, also, we have here the true end of this history, which differs at last from the histories of all other nations most of all in this that the individual political people perishes only to be transformed into a nation of a much higher and purely spiritual importance, into the nation, or the community, of the perfect true religion, which, like the religion itself, when once founded, can never pass away till, with the consummation of all human things on this earth, it attains its own proper destination. The history of Israel had a predisposition and, as it were, a predestination to this its last issue from its very first commencement onwards, as was shown in the first two volumes of this work. In the second great period of its history the nation gained the right prophetic feeling and conception of the

[1] Melito's apology was thought to have been rediscovered in Cureton's *Spicil. Syriacum*, but I have shown in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1856, pp. 655–659 that this fragment is a genuine and instructive production of Melito's, though not his apology but his work περὶ ἀληθείας.

[2] *Ante*, p. 103.

way in which this divine destination would be accomplished, in spite of all human errors and hindrances, and thereby it obtained the right basis for its spiritual endeavour.[1] But it was not until the period just reviewed that it became in all respects clear in what way and with what struggles it could alone be rightly accomplished. Christianity had then incorporated all that was really noble and glorious in the ancient nation, and had brought about its complete glorification; and the immortal elements which gradually strove more eagerly to burst the narrow limits in which they had first to be gathered together and expanded, now that those limits have been burst in the right way, live and work on in Christianity, in order to produce a new still loftier life in an incomparably wider sphere.

Even, therefore, if the nation of Israel had a more unhappy end[2] as regards its existence and remnants on the earth than any other, still, as regards its higher and eternal importance, no other nation of antiquity was thus glorified in the midst of its destruction, and no other perpetuated such an immortal existence in a divine sense in the midst of its own glorified community. After numerous hindrances had been overcome, the consummation which had been prepared for in the Community at length arrived in such a way that the nation which failed to adopt it, and yet sought supremacy, necessarily met its end. The true and immortal elements which when properly recognised and accepted are obligatory on all men were from the beginning the soul of the history of this nation, and form the necessary basis of progressive personal and national life. But they had been so long hindered and obscured by the purely national limitations and temporal defects that had gathered around them that the perfect consummation to be expected was threatened with extinction. Happily, the consummation came with the destruction of the national hindrances, and instead of the earthly perishable Israel there arose at the end of this third great epoch of the national history that purely immortal and spiritual Israel which was felt to be a divine necessity at the beginning of the epoch.[3] This was the goal to which the history tended from the elevation of its first epoch, and which was prophetically foreseen and demanded during the calm middle period of the history. It was thus but one idea and one lofty object which in the history of this nation combined and conducted to this necessary goal everything which seemed so heterogeneous and confused. For the nation had from its first entrance upon the scene of national history been wholly inspired in its pro-

[1] As was shown vol. iii [2] *Ante*, pp. 294 sq. [3] See vol. v.

foundest life and endeavour by this single idea alone, and had been so possessed by it that its whole existence on earth, whether when erring or when making progress, whether conquering or being finally destroyed, could never again be for any length of time separated from it; and its whole history at last became simply a manifestation and exposition of this one ruling idea and its object. And since the history of no other nation of antiquity is bound up like this with a single unalterable idea, and one that is besides so pre-eminently true and immortal, no other nation has ever met such an end and has been so directly transformed into a much loftier continuation of itself. We see here at the conclusion of this long and varied history everything confirmed which we had to take as our basis [1] at its commencement.

But just as this is the real end of this history, it is also its necessary and eternal end; and all those still current notions that the nation which then perished will ever rise again and continue its history are in the highest degree mistaken, as are all efforts based upon such opinions. Remnants of the Samaritans and Judeans have indeed, since those dreadful days of the real end of their importance as a nation and also as a religious community, tried to establish and consolidate themselves afresh. After every such storm the bent reed strives to raise itself again; in Hadrian's decrees there was also much that was harsh simply on account of the temporary provocations; and as soon as the harshness of the laws was but a little mitigated, the sufferers from them easily concluded that they must be again altogether done away with, and all former institutions be revived. And in fact, if these late Samaritan and Judean communities had only always had Heathenism as their real antagonist they would have had a divine necessity for their existence, and the whole long past history of the struggle between Israel and Heathenism (for the former had only this latter as its real adversary) might possibly have been repeated. But in that case, too, both must have had something more to rest on than, on the one hand, a *senile* recollection of former greatness and of lofty truths which had once lived in their midst; and, on the other, the new and irrational idea that all such past greatness and glory might return to them again if they only held fast to the sacred Scriptures which they had inherited, and to the many deductions drawn from them in the schools. And as they were possessed solely by these two ideas, it is evident that they could not contend even against simple

[1] See vol. i.

Heathenism as the true Israel had once done. But if they now wished to establish themselves afresh, they must necessarily oppose Christianity also; and the Talmud is essentially nothing else than the renewal of the struggle of Akîba and Bar-Kôkheba against both Christianity and Heathenism, at least at the commencement in the province of doctrine and learning, and with all the precautions which the altered circumstances demanded. But in this the judgment of history is pronounced. The Talmud falls far behind the truth, greatness, and glory which were already gained within the sacred borders of the people of Israel before its dissolution, and engages in a conflict with them without even rightly understanding them. Indeed, it could not be otherwise if the Hagiocracy was to be preserved as the lifeless crust of the ancient true religion only temporarily recalled to life by the influence of an Akîba.

The great adaptiveness and variety of human culture allow such stiffened and degenerate remains of older, purer, and more healthy national and religious developments to exist for a length of time; as, for instance, it temporarily endured hybrid developments like the Judeo-Christianity of a former time, and still tolerates existing Islam. It is essentially a matter of indifference how long such a late offshoot lasts in its narrower sphere. The Samaritan communities, for instance, which before this final period had never been so widely spread or built on so firm a foundation as the Judean communities, having since almost wholly disappeared, while the Judean communities, which had in comparison a firmer foundation, have been preserved in some countries in considerable numbers. It is also true that a nation can undergo the most wonderful changes, no nation having proved this so clearly as ancient Israel. In each of the three great epochs of its history we have found its character at last apparently completely altered: in the first it was a wonderfully warlike nation; in the second it became distinguished in art and science; in the third truly learned in divine things (theological): and if it held fast in all these periods to the principle of the same religion that had been its characteristic in ancient times, what different forms this principle took in each of them! Even the national names change in these three great epochs; and if the three names—Hebrews, Israel, Judeans—almost exactly correspond to the changes in the nation during those epochs,[1] we shall do well to confine the modern name *Jews*[2] to

[1] Vol. i. pp. 10, 284.

[2] The use of this name in modern times is utterly wrong and unreasonable, and the greatest mischief is still continually springing from this confusion.

these mere remnants of the true ancient people, as they appear in history after the time of Trajan, when they cannot be put on a level with the nation itself. If, however, it be asserted that these remnants might in future again form a nation or rule an empire, as even some modern Christians suppose, on account of a disgraceful misunderstanding of certain Old Testament prophecies, it must first be proved that they have formed a nation at all since Hadrian; an assertion which no one who understands the matter will make. They are rather like creepers that cling to other trees, and prefer strong and lofty ones, trying at times to choke them, and often deprive them of light and air, but can never support either themselves or others. There is indeed often a more or less true reflection of the ancient glory of Israel which illuminates these still growing torn-off shoots, or at least casts an external glimmer over them; and the greatness of that glory may be seen from these occasional late effects of it: but in fact other and far mightier forces sustain and guide these remnants. It is the forces of learning and art, or any other influence that at times raises the real nations to a higher level, which may for a time fertilise and elevate them also; but because they lack true independence the mere lower instinct of self-preservation, even by unworthy means, easily becomes dominant in them. Thus in the Middle Ages the Jews became quite different according to the civilisation and pursuit of the particular people among which they lived, and instead of originating any movement, or even of energetically opposing the real evils of the particular time and nation, they have always allowed themselves to be led and determined by them. They have never, not even in the earliest part of the Middle Ages and beyond the countries of the Roman empire at the limits of the then known world, been able to found and maintain States of their own, were it only for a short time;[1] and the best that the best of them can do to-day is to oscillate continually between a lofty past, which they claim as theirs, but which they do not even rightly understand and value, and Christianity with all its ever-growing treasures of knowledge and piety, on which they live, without being thankful for them, and even while trying to lessen or destroy them. But if the endeavour should ever anywhere be made to found a new kingdom of Israel, it would soon be seen that the Law of the Old Testament, which is still alone binding in the Talmud and among the Rabbis, can no longer be carried out, and that Christianity

[1] As the history of the kingdom of Yemen and of that amongst the Chozars sufficiently proves.

cannot be dispensed with; and should true Christianity not then be resorted to, it must be a Christianity of a lower and long-since condemned type. Or if the Talmud, as far as it contradicts the Old Testament, were given up, as was once done by the Karaites, and a return were made to the Old Testament simply, only with a better understanding of it, and more decidedly than they did, with a restoration of its sacrifices and belief in its prophecies, it would then be found how little such a surrender of the Talmud was possible, and how necessarily this resort to the Old Testament would lead to that same historical Christ it is resolved not to accept. Oh, what folly is it, therefore, purposely to be blind to what has long been so plain and true, and of the highest importance!

It is also further certain that all such aftergrowths have, at least for a time, their limited justification and their conditional advantage. At the time when the Heathen Roman empire was seeking to destroy the Ancient Community with all its sacred things, Christianity was too suddenly, and hence almost prematurely, thrown into the midst of the great Græco-Roman world. It was then becoming estranged from profoundly antagonistic Judeanism, while it had not yet by a long way completed its own system; and, as a rule, it understood the Messianic prophecies too literally. At that time it was a great advantage for all that scattered fragments of the Ancient Community still existed, and that among them especially the writings of the Old Testament, which otherwise might easily have been lost, were preserved in the Jewish and Samaritan communities with all the greater faithfulness. It was therefore in many respects excusable that the Talmud should be formed, and that much which was not rightly and completely understood by the Christianity of these early times should be more fully handed down in its communities. The Talmudic system, as the first work of the kind after the destruction of the nation, had some degrees of justification on its side, and sprang from a certain historical necessity. The real internal dissolution of Rabbinic Judaism did not begin until the Karaites[1] rightly perceived the imperfections of the Talmud, though a thorough attempt was nowhere made to remove them. Rabbinic Judaism had a right to exist as a protest against Islam, although at first it foolishly enough made overtures to it; it has still a right as a protest against all false Christianity. And just as nothing is without its use, the existence of this Judaism may and ought to remind us at the present day that our modern

[1] *Ante*, p. 41.

Christianity is very far from being what it ought to be, either in theory or in actual life; for it is from its errors and imperfections alone that modern Judaism derives most of the strength by which it lives. But all such observations and reflections cannot overturn the great truth that the onward march of the history of the world since Christ appeared in Israel has been that of Christianity; and that the matter of the greatest moment is what form this latter takes, and whether it remains true to its own destiny or not.

So much in refutation of the error that the history of Israel does not in reality and for ever here cease. In fact, the history of this nation ends in the way which the greatest prophets of Israel foresaw when it was at its highest noontide splendour. They foresaw that only a small remnant of the nation would, after a repeated and most severe process of refining and trial of the great whole, become, as the indestructible germ of a glorified Israel, the commencement of a new and higher community. This they foresaw; and much of this was fulfilled at the first destruction of Jerusalem, but the fulfilment was not until now complete. Israel, from the times of its greatest prophets, passed again and again through the severest siftings, such as no other nation had gone through; even the last and most extreme revolts against the true religion that was rising towards perfection had to be overcome in its midst, that the kingdom of the perfect true religion with its community might be formed within it. And this is the immortal germ, purified a thousand times, which became the basis and immovable foundation of the Christian Church.

Christianity is thus, not merely the only logical, but also the only saving issue of this whole history, without which it would end in dreary night. As soon as it has been completely established upon the earth (which had only now been accomplished), the end of this history, which was so involved and apparently so often hopeless, returns to the bright beginning; what at the commencement of all this long development strove to burst through into light, but was then still too weak, has now burst forth in all its power; and it casts its light backwards on the dark windings of the long and difficult development, so that neither do they remain wholly in darkness. The most elevating and saving thing that antiquity more or less clearly longed to obtain for the purification and guidance of all other human works and pursuits has at last become a safe possession of humanity. It is only when this has been gained that national Israel, as the simple instrument for its attain-

ment, may end its existence, and the Ancient World close, in order that a new great day of history may begin. And this New World, subsequent to the foundation of Christianity, has also, in its long course of development, not only met with numerous epochs and revolutions, but has also passed through seemingly dark, or even disastrous, crises. It is not, however, the object of this work to sketch its further history.

THE HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

But all this great and long history ends at last not merely with the deeds that were done and events that occurred in the open day and before all the world, and it is not perpetuated merely in the communities which sprang from it, with their institutions and customs. It ends at the same time with the production and collection of Sacred Scriptures, which is accomplished without noise and away from the gaze of the world; and it is perpetuated for ever in these Scriptures, especially, as its plainest results and witnesses. The history of the collection of these writings (or, as it is now usually called, the history of the *Canon* of the Bible) is an integral part of the history of the nation, and it may most properly form its conclusion, as only with the end of the great political history is it itself completed, and as it runs parallel with that history till the last. It began indeed long previous to this last period, as we have stated above, but cannot be easily viewed as a whole until it is here completed.

It is, indeed, the case with the other ancient nations that the finest, and intrinsically noble, works in their literatures are most adequately appreciated and most carefully collected only at the end of one of their great mental and political epochs. In the struggles and confusions of the hour the worst book is often most sought after, and the best most neglected; and amongst the great mass of books which, in the case of an intellectually aroused nation, can easily under favourable circumstances become immense, the noblest and most important work is in danger of being swept away together with the most trifling and unimportant. But, in reality, the separation of the valuable from the worthless on such occasions always takes place insensibly; and a new period, which is at a distance from the undecided present, and looks back on it more impartially and with richer experience, simply completes this separation. This sifting process was in ancient times wont to be the more stringent the less these times possessed efficient means for the external preservation of books, or the more a nation suffered from dispersion and devastation; since every ancient literature at first flourished only on the sacred bosom of a distinct vigorous nationality, and was protected by it: so that the more

ancient originally and the more unfortunate later a nation possessing a literature was, the more naturally were only the most imperishable portions of its literature preserved, and these again only in extracts and occasional fragments. But though the fate of the literature of Israel did not differ in any of these respects from that of the other ancient nations of superior culture, yet it had a peculiar characteristic of another kind, by which the preservation and collection of the most immortal and glorious portions of the whole body of it necessarily received finally a very special form and an altogether unequalled importance.

This peculiar characteristic which distinguished the literature of Israel had its origin in the unique nature of the whole history of the nation, as this appears in every period, but especially after it had attained its highest elevation. For, not only does every literature, as based upon the innate primitive powers of human speech and poetry and the instrumentality of writing, most surely contain within itself the conditions and motives of its origin and development, but its whole intellectual character takes very different shapes according to the spiritual influences that are dominant in the nation; and this was especially the case in remote antiquity, when each nation strove with greater originality and individuality, in conformity with its own intellectual character, after that special object of human endeavour which appeared to it to be the highest. As therefore the highest endeavour of Israel became more exclusively and definitely the attainment of the true, and at last of the perfect true religion, and as at last before its complete dissolution it really gained this lofty object, its whole literature, not less than its language, accordingly became in the course of the many centuries more and more exclusively serviceable to this most lofty object, and took ever more completely the form which made it its most pliant and suitable instrument.

The contents and value of the whole of this literature did thus, indeed, on the one side become constantly more restricted; and we have above followed in detail and clearly proved that in the highest periods of the nation's life this literature embraced all the chief departments of human literature, with the richest and most fruitful results, and that it gradually concentrated itself ever more exclusively and more closely upon the great conflict for the perfect true religion. But, on the other hand, the literature thus became, in the narrower sphere of thought and endeavour to which it gradually confined itself, more and more indefatigable, and acquired growing freedom and more perfect develop-

ment, thus becoming increasingly capable of worthily expressing the purest and highest truth possible to it. And thus the sifting and selection of this literature took the form which time with its stern judgment brought about; and, in accordance with the time, the collection and preservation of this literature, which was at last effected, was such that only such writings withstood the winnowing storm of the ages and sank to the bottom for specially careful preservation as had the greatest importance for the true religion, as the acknowledged highest national treasure, and finally for the perfect true religion; and they therefore were on that very account ever more generally and willingly recognised as *sacred* writings.[1]

In this, therefore, we meet a special feature and a wholly unique superiority of the history of this nation. For, with all their wealth, neither Greek nor Roman literature produced books which contained sufficient religion to render them truly sacred to the whole nation as a basis of true religion, since neither the Homeric nor the Sibylline poems can be thought of in this connection. Amongst the Egyptians, Chinese, Hindoos, Zarathustrians, and Buddhists, it is true, Sacred Books arose at an early period, as amongst the Hebrews; but they fell so far behind those which became sacred amongst the Hebrews, in subject, matter, and perfection of form, that though they might well become, for a time, sacred to their own nation, they could never be this to all nations and all times. For the true religion itself was never sufficiently firmly established amongst these peoples, still less sufficiently practically effective and progressively developed to enable the best books which were most fitted to expound the religion of each of these nations or communities to approach in point of sublimity and absolute perfection those which arose in Israel. It is true the idea of sacredness is very elastic: but we cannot properly call any writings universally and permanently sacred but those which actually serve as authorities with regard to the history of the growth of the perfect true religion, and as explanatory expositions of the contents of its truths and duties. If, therefore, we inquire as to the ultimate origin of this great difference in the nature of the Hebrew and the other sacred writings, we are referred to the early history of the foundation of the true religion in Israel. Because in Israel the true religion was not merely acknowledged in its principles, but became the life of the whole nation in a true community, it was gradually implanted in the inmost heart

[1] See my essay on 'Die Heligkeit der Bibel,' *Jahrbb. der B. W.* vii. pp. 68 sq. [also *Bibl. Theol.* §§ 116–33, Eng. Transl. pp. 375 sq.]

of all the noblest sections of the people, and then reacted again most powerfully on the whole nation. It thus penetrated gradually more and more deeply the entire life and endeavour of the nation, pointing out to it its highest duties as well as its most exalted aims; it purified and elevated the whole of the nation's view of things with its laws, its songs, the whole of its poetry, and all its experiences and recollections: it thus permeated more and more powerfully and purely the national documents and writings of all kinds, being perpetuated with its intrinsic sacredness in them before they had received an extraneous sanctity or were called in the world sacred writings. This constant reciprocal action between the perception and the experience of the highest impulses and aims of the true religion, on the one hand, and literature as one expression and product of the whole national life, on the other, was the essentially important thing. In consequence of it only such writings could seem in the end the worthiest to be preserved and honoured as contained most clearly and certainly for all the truths of the perfect true religion. Thus, as a fact, practically no writings became in this case sacred which do not either directly breathe forth the spirit of the true religion or explain its history, while none refer simply to separate classes in the nation. The sacred books of other nations are either based upon an inferior and untrue religion, or the best of them (especially those of the Buddhists) did not originate in a national community of true religion with its full human life, and were not meant for such a community.

Such is the true view in general of the origin and formation of the sacred books of Israel, to which those of the New Testament necessarily belong, as having been produced before Israel's complete dissolution. It follows from this view of their origin that the Sacred Books could not generally be produced until towards the time of the gradual dissolution of the ancient nation. The exalted truths, which could be appropriated in life only with difficulty, had first to be thus appropriated by the inmost spirit of the people; and then they had to be transferred from the national life into writing, that they might be gradually immortalised in a fuller and clearer form. After all this had been done a time was required in the life of the nation, when the writings containing such truths could be generally properly appreciated, before it would be resolved to make the writings the immortal mirror of those truths, and to separate them from the common mass of books. Thus in such sacred writings two things were for ever preserved—an abundance of trustworthy

evidence regarding the historical origin and the most perfect representation of the truths and the essential substance of them —and the fact that these two things are found combined in them is their greatest characteristic superiority.

But this process was of such a nature that it could not at once adequately attain its object. The truths which were thus to be immortalised were very numerous and very various, and, especially towards the end of the history, were presented in ever higher perfection, so that successive series of increasingly rich truths followed one another.

We must also add that the first formation of sacred writings could nowhere, and particularly in this nation of the true religion, be accomplished without great difficulty and but very slowly. It appears to us very easy, but it is in fact a very difficult labour. For suppose that a best selection of writings has at a certain time and for a certain object been made according to the judgment of the generality of people, it is a long step from such a distinction to that of sanctity. To make writings sacred, it is necessary that the whole community should vow to submit to their contents, and that each individual should in all his life hallow them ever afresh. But what a tremendous resolution is that, especially when the religion itself is so serious, and strict holiness obtains its full meaning from it! Moreover, in such a case, it is not a few brief truths which are to be considered sacred; a great pile of books, or a great book which contains many and various things, is to be regarded as sacred, and claims to take the place of the God that speaks. And is it possible for a book to take the place of even the God that speaks to men—at least in the region of the true religion? Where had the great Prophets of the Old Testament ever appealed to a sacred book? It was not until the most imperative necessities arose that the nation of the community of the true religion could at last be brought to acknowledge a Sacred Book with all that seriousness which characterised its religion from the first. The beginning was here also the greatest difficulty; nothing but a specially favourable time, in conjunction with powerful impulses of early date, could in this case lay the first foundation for Sacred Scriptures. But when once this had been laid, and the community had habituated itself to the distinction between sacred and profane writings, the process might be more easily repeated whenever similar motives came into play. For Christianity, however, as the ultimate consummation of this history, it was of great importance that the dangers which are inherent in the hallowing of a book and a

letter could be correctly perceived and avoided at the time of its origin, as we have seen above. And thus it was especially three or four favourable periods towards the end of the history of the nation in which the collections of Sacred Writings, as in three or four successive layers, were completely formed, so that upon the first firm basis of such writings others, corresponding to and enlarging it, were gradually placed.

It is true, as we have said, that these three or four favourable periods all appear in quick succession towards the end of the national history; the first and most difficult step having been properly taken, each succeeding one soon follows, until at last, with the healthy development of the great cause, everything involved was brought to perfection. But although the first of these steps was taken late with reference to the whole history, it followed soon after the history had reached its noontide, before the second of its three great epochs was quite closed. And each stratum of such writings contains the finest and most imperishable products of a past period. It is therefore a most happy coincidence that each of the three fundamental strata of these books was laid, more or less closely, at the end of one of the three epochs of the national history, and each became a perpetual monument of the epoch of time which had just passed away. At the same time the first stratum, as the one most difficult of formation, was naturally formed at the greatest distance from the epoch of time which preceded it, while each of the following strata succeeded more and more closely its corresponding epoch. But as the last of the three great epochs, when the whole products of the national history are approaching maturity and the fruits on the aged tree become so various, presents the endeavours which are possible in this sphere in increasingly rapid succession and greater divergence, so towards the end of it the new layers of Sacred Books, which are still added to the preceding ones, become more numerous and more various; and the variety of the communities into which the ancient parent community of the true religion is gradually hopelessly split up is represented in the last formation of Sacred Books. It is accordingly of great significance that the three most favourable periods in which the Holy Scriptures were successively accumulated in three principal strata correspond to the full development of the three great sections into which the ancient religion was by degrees divided—the Samaritan, the Judean, and the Christian. So that in the way in which Sacred Books are formed and retained

in each period we may perceive the spirit which animates each, and the stage on which each finally succeeded in finding repose.

It must therefore have always been a favourable time in which the conviction of the sacredness of certain books was determined. And most of all the first of these times must with irresistible force have urged the nation to make some larger book the foundation of its whole spiritual aim and view of things; whilst after the people of the one true religion had gradually submitted itself to this restraint of regarding a considerable book as holy, and of ordering its whole life in everything according to it, no other ancient nation had such profound reverence for its sacred writings or defended them so resolutely as Israel, though to it originally it was something other than a book which was to be holy. However, when once a basis of this kind had been laid, and the idea of a sacred book had become familiar to the community, other books might easily be deemed worthy of being added to it; and then the most favourable times more readily occurred when such an augmentation might step by step advance. But then the impulse might naturally be felt to place as many books as possible in the number of the sacred ones, especially as the preservation of a single book was best secured when it could find a place amongst them. On the other hand, in the bosom of a community of the true religion, the feeling remained no less vigilant that a book which was intended to increase the number of acknowledged sacred ones must correspond to them as regards intrinsic sanctity and greatness as well as being indispensable for the community. Thus the choice with regard to not a few particular books was undecided for a considerable time during the conflict of these two opposing motives, until at last some new experience or perception gave the decision. The history of the collection of all the Sacred Scriptures is in so far very long and varied; and we may see particularly by its issue very plainly how great was the hesitation at times; yet the beginnings of the collection, although we have less information regarding them, may be discerned with substantial clearness. Still, since books as such and the full life of the true religion can never be commensurable, it is also possible that, however long a necessary nucleus of Sacred Scripture has existed, uncertainty may remain at last regarding one or another particle of it; indeed this will be the more likely to occur in proportion as a community of the true religion correctly feels the existence of that chasm which must ever separate the letter and the life.

1. *The Work which First became Sacred.*

The Book of Sacred History and Sacred Law.

The Decalogue and after it many other written laws, as the nature of the case implies and as has been shown in the first four volumes of this work, were from the first sacred to the nation, or at all events ought to have been, and as a fact in the better times they were sacred to the nation as a whole, and were always so to the best men of Israel. Ancient fundamental laws of this kind were always preserved in the Sanctuary,[1] and at the time of the monarchy every new ruler was on his accession most solemnly sworn to observe them.[2] But a great book containing the laws that are to be sacred to the people only as interwoven with the early sacred history generally, is a very different thing from the laws themselves; it is in form and nature more of an historical than a legal work. A great work of sacred history and sacred law of this kind could not so soon acquire a high authority binding on an entire community. Indeed, it could not even be written in the nation very early and easily. And when literature had progressed so far as the composition of such works—and in the rivalry of the times and talents several works of this kind had been written and also widely circulated—the essential thing was again that from such a multitude the best book should be selected and acknowledged generally as the best. Not until this stage was reached could the straits of calamitous experiences and of a new urgent condition of public affairs lead the nation, following the example of a few great minds, to accept such a work as a sacred one and submit to its sacred contents.

We have seen[3] that it was the work of the Deuteronomist which in the declining kingdom of Judah was first raised to such a dignity, owing to the concurrence of most various urgent motives, and the unusual and happy co-operation of the king Josiah and his people, B.C. 621. This first great historical book, which, on account of its contents, was destined to become the foundation of all laws and all religious life in Israel, and which at that time was received by the nation as a sacred book with a fervour and earnestness the influence of which could not but have eternal consequences, was not yet the

[1] Deut. xxxi. 26; 1 Sam. x. 25.

[2] 2 Kings xi. 12 (2 Chron. xxiii. 11), comp. *Antiquities*, p. 274. But it was probably not merely the original Decalogue but other fundamental laws likewise to which the kings were sworn in any case, however, before the time of Josiah it was not a large historical book.

[3] Vol. iv. pp. 233 sq.

work afterwards called the Pentateuch, but another great and distinct work, the chief part of which was afterwards preserved in the Pentateuch. We can also easily understand that the reputation of sacredness which this first book of the kind gained was not in these early times quite so high or so inflexible as it subsequently grew to be in the case of the Pentateuch, commonly so called. On the contrary, one of the earliest consequences of this new reverence for a great book of sacred history and sacred law, and of the study of the biblical books which through it rose to an unprecedented height, was evidently that then the older works of similar contents were also all the more zealously sought after; and under these circumstances it was inevitable that skilful hands should incorporate very much important matter of a similar kind coming from different sources in one or the other new large work, as it could not be forbidden in any way to use in addition to the Book of Deuteronomy, in the first instance for learned purposes, similar works, or to compare the more recent Deuteronomy with earlier works with similar subject-matter, and to combine it with them.[1] Thus arose that very extensive work which received into it the chief part of Deuteronomy, and was destined to become finally the first sacred book: it is the book the main portion of which acquired the name of the Pentateuch. It may have received its present form before the complete overthrow of the kingdom of Judah, and from the first it decidedly excelled the distinct work of Deuteronomy by being largely and admirably made up of all the most important, and particularly the earlier and the earliest, works of the same nature, so that it could most efficiently represent this entire literature of the Primitive History and Primitive Law as it had been forming for several centuries. It was one work, and yet from its composite character it resembled a complete layer of books with kindred subject-matter, it being the practice in those times[2] to compress together the most important contents of most various books of similar character in this form. If one great work with subject-matter of this kind was to acquire permanent dignity of the highest degree and sacredness, this work was decidedly better fitted for this distinction than the original work of Deuteronomy alone.[3] Still, it would not have so easily taken the place of the work of the

[1] Jeremiah and Ezekiel make large use of the Book of Deuteronomy, but in conjunction with other works with similar contents; and if Ezekiel had not continued to use a larger degree of freedom in all these matters, he would not have proceeded as he has done, ch. xlv.–xlviii., as legislator for the future. Comp. further vol. i. pp. 129 sq., 178.

[2] Vol. i. pp. 59 sq.

[3] In much the same way as in the case of the New Testament it was wiser

Deuteronomist in this respect if the last remnants of a kingdom of Judah had not about that time been quickly destroyed, and the period had not arrived when everything was broken up and the dispersed nation was compelled to recover itself again from its ultimate elements. In these circumstances this excellent work of the Primitive History and Laws, we must infer from the historical traces left, was drifted from the Holy Land into the Eastern countries, and was there, in the first instance, chiefly revered as sacred in those Judean communities which were distinguished above all others both by their faithfulness to the ancient religion and by their biblical learning. From those quarters it then came through Ezra to Jerusalem with that great movement of biblical scholarship which he brought with him when he settled in the Holy City, and from that moment it became the first imperishably sacred book of the restored community of a national Israel.[1]

This work, which was very extensive for a sacred book, comprised, at first, the Book of Joshua, which was subsequently more and more frequently separated from it; and it, with the latter book, was undoubtedly early divided into six books—a division which was somewhat arbitrary, as the entire work was made up of earlier ones. As regards the subject-matter, only the first, the fifth, and the Book of Joshua could naturally be separated, whilst the separation of the second and third, and of them from the fourth, has evidently no other origin than the desire to get six sections of nearly equal length. It was, however, very early the custom to name one or all of the books from this number. In Philo the name Pentateuch is still absent, as the favourite name for the whole work is *the Law*; yet the

to receive all four Gospels than one only. This comparison is the more justifiable since undoubtedly into the present Pentateuch, with the Book of Joshua which belongs to it, all that was best and most imperishable of the entire Primitive History was compressed, as I have shown vol. i. and elsewhere.

[1] Erroneous as the late Jewish belief, which was not decidedly rejected by Jerome, was, as we have seen (vol. v. p. 164), that Ezra was the restorer or finisher of the Mosaic Pentateuch, it is nevertheless undeniable that with him a great wave of sacred learning flowed from the East to Jerusalem (v. pp. 131 sq.), and that Ezra might therefore bring with him to Jerusalem the best original text of the Sacred Law that could then be found. And as the connection of biblical learning at Jerusalem with that at Babylon never afterwards wholly ceased, but continued to distinguish the biblical scholarship of Jerusalem from that of Samaria, the use of the new Hebrew character in contradistinction from the Samaritan, i.e. old Hebrew (see *Heb. Gram.* § 77 *b*) may have since then been all along retained in the learned schools of Jerusalem in the first instance, and have been gradually extended until it at last quite superseded the earlier character. The latter, as continually used by the Samaritans, might be kept up also amongst the Judeans for various purposes, especially on the coins, on which an older character is everywhere longest preserved; and accordingly it is found on the latest coins, *ante*, p. 283.

Hellenists had then long since accustomed themselves to distinguish the various books by a short name.[1]

The Canon. The Samaritan Pentateuch.

By the recognition of the Pentateuch, including its predecessor, as a holy book, the great step had been taken which was at first so difficult, but when once taken easily led on to others. The community, numerous and widely scattered though it was, had not unwillingly recognised the authority, and at least in all disputed matters of religion had submitted to the decision, of a written work the exceedingly varied contents of which—far beyond the single commands contained therein—could determine and guide its whole spiritual life. The whole spiritual life of the nation could not therefore now become very vacillating and uncertain again for any length of time, since it henceforth possessed even in a great book an unvarying guiding star by which to direct its course: and the dangers which lay in this fact were then but little developed. At the same time this one book which the nation now followed with devoted conviction had already been victorious over the changes of time, and from the wide field of literature, as far as it had till then been developed, at least this one comparatively extensive work had been saved for all time.

A once recognised sacred book is thus a guiding-star, or (for the same thought may be expressed by many metaphors) a *rule*, or standard, of truth or true religion which must be regarded as valid and to be believed; just as Christian authors afterwards were wont to speak of the *Canon* with reference to the Bible. But if only one work is once universally acknowledged as a sacred book, a standard, or a Canon, may be easily thus supplied for the cases when some other work is associated with it as its equal in dignity and truth, or in indispensableness for the community, or (as was afterwards said in Greek) when fresh writings are to be received into the Canon.[2] The necessity,

[1] The name *Genesis* is very old; the name *Exodus*, in the longer and more original form *Exagoge*, is met with in Philo (see vol. vii. p. 222), *Deuteronomy* occurs in the Epistle of Barnabas, cap. 10, and תּוֹרַת כֹּהֲנִים as identical with *Leviticus* is found twice, *M.* Megilla iii. 6; all the five names of the Hellenistic Pentateuch were found together in the book of Simon Magus, see Hippol. *Contra Hær.* vi. 15, 16; and five books of Moses are definitely mentioned, Jos. *Contra Ap.* i. 8. We may infer from all this that though these names may not have been much used in Philo's time they were in existence in the centuries immediately before Christ.

[2] This is the meaning of *κανονίζεσθαι*. In fact, nothing more can be briefly said about the idea of the Canon and Canonical books, comp. the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* ix. pp. 97 sq. The contrary גְּנִיזָה, *M.* Sopherim, i. 9, 14; v. 4, 13, *ἀποκρύφειν*, has at the same time the further

or at any rate the advisability, of this may be gradually deeply felt: the Canon once in existence can be by degrees extended, as has been remarked above.

Now, it is of the greatest importance to notice that at the very time when in Jerusalem the expediency of adding several books to the existing basis of a collection of Sacred Scriptures made itself more profoundly felt, and this idea was really being carried out there, in the other half of the Holy Land, among the Samaritans, the very first and most simple Canon was all the more resolutely kept to. Towards the end of Nehemiah's activity, in the fifth century, the Samaritans did indeed receive the Pentateuch of Jerusalem,[1] but since then would receive no sacred book from that quarter, but, on the contrary, persisted in the assertion that there could be no Sacred Writings besides those which were then universally ascribed directly to Moses. This is closely connected with the great difference generally which separated them from the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem. They thought that they possessed and defended what was most truly sacred from ancient times in all its uniqueness and purity, and were nevertheless greatly mistaken.

For it is quite true that the Pentateuch is itself an unusually rich and varied work with the highest and most important subject-matter. While it proceeded from the stream of a very long and highly developed literature of Primitive History, and then in turn combined and preserved in a small compass all that was finest and most imperishable of that literature, it likewise contains the most marvellous wealth, not merely of ideas and truths, but also of literary form and expression. It presents the most comprehensive and important and again the most varied laws, tells the most sublime and at the same time the most popular, the most remote, and yet the most instructive histories suitable for all, and in both narrative and legislation touches on the highest truths of all true religion; and it also introduces a number of most varied prophecies, and rises to irresistible exhortation, as well as to overpowering denunciation; it has also received into its treasury longer or shorter poems of all kinds and styles. Thus it is in reality of itself a complete literature in miniature, with the utmost variety of contents and most attractive literary art, and is undoubtedly better adapted, with its almost inexhaustible treasures, than the Koran (for instance) to become the fundamental book of a community of the true religion. It is even still, we may say, the Bible in

meaning that a book is not considered to be acknowledged as a suitable *public*, i.e. ecclesiastical, authority.

[1] See vol. v. pp. 216 sq.

miniature. For the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem also it necessarily always continued to be sacred beyond any other book, not merely as the basis of all legislation, but also as a manual for children as well as for old people, and as a book to employ the minds of the wisest. At the same time, it is no less true that a period soon came when it no longer sufficed to meet all the requirements of the true religion in its fuller development. For this religion had, in the course of centuries under the great prophets, poets, and national leaders after Moses, been progressively developed, and had been perpetuated in a large number of entirely different books, which were not in any way directly connected with the Primitive History and Primitive Laws, or at most referred to them only in a free way; and although some of the truths of the later prophets had found their way into some of these presentations of the Primitive History and Laws, this had been done only incidentally and in a veiled manner. It would have been arbitrary and in the end necessarily injurious to have completely excluded all these other books, some of them the best and noblest, for all time from a share in the authority of the Pentateuch, and to have in no way associated them with it. This feeling very properly obtained amongst the Judeans at an early period, and happily led amongst them to further progress in the formation of the Canon.

But the Samaritan leaders were determined to accept nothing, whether the enlargement of the Canon or anything else, from the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem, imagining that the true religion was contained completely and plainly enough in the Pentateuch, and that any further addition to it could be productive of nothing but harm. A further obstacle was that the books which had been added by degrees in Jerusalem were almost all of them by Judean authors, and might contribute much more to the glory of Jerusalem than to that of Samaria; Samaritan jealousy had an intense dislike of such books. Even the Book of Joshua, which originally belonged to the Pentateuch, was dropped by the Samaritans, because it spoke of Jerusalem as a great ancient city; though the name of such a book has been preserved in a later historical work of theirs,[1] the design of which was especially to describe the life and labours of Joshua so as to make him the ideal of a national prince according to the ideas and desires of the Samaritans of the Middle Ages. But by thus resolving obstinately not to go beyond the Pentateuch as their Sacred Scripture, they really

[1] See vol. v. pp. 220–222, 281.

simply limited more and more their range of spiritual vision, and lost far more than they gained by the supposed superior simplicity and uniformity of their Sacred Scripture, just as the Muslim have lost infinitely more than they gained with their meagre Koran. With this resolution it had been decided that the Samaritans, in spite of the greater freedom of which they boasted, and which they possessed in some respects, were determined to remain upon an antiquated and restricted standpoint, and far behind the greater wealth of the Judeans. In fact, this defect came gradually to be felt amongst them, though they could not permanently make it good; and many of the Samaritan Gnostics,[1] such as Simon, availed themselves of the sacred books of the Judeans amongst others.

2. *The Double Addition to the Judean Canon.*

The Canon of Nehemiah.

It was therefore a perfectly just feeling which urged the Judeans to increase the Sacred Scriptures, the foundation of which had been laid and permanently established, by the addition of other writings of a similar high authority and worthy of their predecessors in the Canon. The first Canon had only just been settled amongst them when the necessity of this second one was felt. We can still perceive with sufficient clearness how and when this addition was made in two great successive strata. For the marks which these writings in their two strata of two very different periods bear upon them, and from which alone we are able with certainty to gather the historical circumstances to which they were due, happily coincide with a few reminiscences, very incidentally preserved, of these two important periods.

The first and in itself most important and for all future time decisive addition was made at the end of the period when the value set on the first nucleus of Sacred Scripture by Ezra was at its highest, and the Samaritans also, carried away by this new zeal, had adopted the Pentateuch as Sacred Scripture. In a somewhat late book we have still preserved the brief statement that Nehemiah combined in a library—(1) the Royal, (2) the Prophetic, (3) the Davidic writings, and (4) Royal Epistles concerning devoted gifts, and added them to the existing foundation of Sacred Scriptures.[2] On close examination this

[1] *Ante*, pp. 83 sq.

[2] Καταβαλλόμενος βιβλιοθήκην ἐπισυνήγαγε τὰ περὶ τῶν βασιλέων καὶ προφητῶν καὶ τὰ τοῦ Δαυὶδ καὶ ἐπιστολὰς βασιλέων

brief and in itself apparently strange statement will be found quite historical and accordingly highly important from the historical point of view; so that we may with full certainty maintain that it had first of all a place in an earlier, detailed, and trustworthy history of Nehemiah's life, and was thence transferred almost verbatim into this late book. The unusual terms for the four portions of the new collection point to a very ancient and rare work as the source of this account; but unusual as it sounds that just these four kinds of books, and precisely from Nehemiah's time onwards, should have been added to the nucleus of the Sacred Writings, the fact itself is amply confirmed.

1. For, as regards the prophetic writings, there is no difficulty in supposing that they (with the exception of the Book of Daniel) were then already found in the same great collection in which they have descended in the Hebrew Canon. Next to the great work of Primitive History and Primitive Law there were in fact no writings so important for the transmission of the true religion as those of the great prophets after Moses, who, in contradistinction to him as the Lawgiver, might be called simply the Prophets. Long before the time of Ezra a vivid feeling of the great importance of these writings was operative. For a century past the attempt had been made to gradually combine as much of the writings of the best older prophets as could be found; and with the unavoidable decay of the ancient prophetic energy many of the most recent prophets were themselves collectors and editors of earlier prophetic writings. It can be proved in detail that collectors and partial reproducers and augmenters of the earlier prophetic writings were especially active in connection with the new life which the end of the Babylonian Exile and the restoration of the New Jerusalem produced; and we can even still plainly show that writings of this kind passed then in the course of a few decades through the hands of several successive editors and collectors.[1] But at

περὶ ἀναθημάτων, 2 Macc. ii. 13; in ἐπισυνήγαγε is implied that this collection of books was made on the basis of an already existing collection, which can only be the Pentateuch; and this is then naturally presupposed as being in existence. Comp. vol. v. pp. 161 sq., 467.

[1] I have shown, *Jahrbb. der B. W.* vii. pp. 28–51, which were the original writings of Isaiah. The collector and editor of the present Book of Isaiah, i.–xxiii., lived towards the end of the sixth century, as may be seen from his additions, xii. xxiii. vv. 15–18; another editor then published the book with the further collection, xxv.–xxxix.; a third with the great appendix, xl.–lxvi., which, however, brings us down only to about 480 B.C. The same late prophet who edited the collection, Isa. i.–xxiii., published also the small Books of Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, and Habakkuk in one collection. A second then republished this *Book of the Minor Prophets* with the addition of the books of Zephaniah, Haggai, and Zechariah, i.–viii. A third added the rest (according to later arrangement, Zech. ix. sq.) at the end and further inserted the little Book of Jonah at an earlier place. This third and last

the time of Nehemiah all such alterations of these books may have been brought to a conclusion; and when it was desired at that time to connect the best prophetic writings still to be had in one collection with the Pentateuch, four books were found of about equal length, (1) the Book of Jeremiah, which had already passed through several re-editings, although without an essential alteration of its original form; (2) the Book of Ezekiel, which remained almost as the prophet wrote it; (3) the so-called Book of Isaiah; and (4) the so-called Book of the Twelve.[1] For in the order then followed the Books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel came first, as it was possibly felt that these two books alone remained on the whole as the prophets wrote them, whilst the other two contained rather smaller writings and fragments of very various character. Another consideration in favour of this order was that the times of the Babylonian Exile which the first two books treated of especially were much more familiar generally to the minds of that later generation than the times mainly dealt with in the other two.

But though these prophetic books necessarily appeared next to the Pentateuch to be the most important and worthy of reverence, it was yet not difficult to perceive that they again were not of themselves sufficient. For the great object in this enlargement of the Canon was really to collect as many as possible of the weightiest utterances of the prophets subsequent to Moses. That series of four great prophetic books attained this object imperfectly only, as they were far from containing the words of all the prophets of those long centuries, particularly not those of many of the oldest prophets which were yet in so many respects exceedingly important.

2. Accordingly, that great work was added which in the list before us is placed first, and which, both from its original name and its contents, can be no other than that *Book of Kings* the origin of which was explained at the beginning of this work.[2] In it are found very many utterances and deeds of great

editor of the *Book of the Twelve Prophets* (*Dodecapropheton*) might publish it about 450-440 B.C. The case is similar with the Book of Jeremiah. This has been shown at length in the *Prophets of the Old Testament*, 2nd edit. 1867 [English ed. London, 1875-1881].

[1] The name Book of the Twelve does not correspond quite accurately to the true contents and origin of the book any more than the name of the Book of Isaiah to its origin and contents. It is allowable to retain names of this kind which have become usual if they are not misunderstood and the object is not to confirm error.

[2] Vol. i. pp. 133-168. This book was called also τῶν βασιλείων, ܕܡܠܟܘܬܐ, or ܕܒܝܬ ܡܘܬܟܐ (formed according to *Heb. Gram.* § 270 *c*); see the *Onomasticon Locorum S. S.* of the Fathers, Hippol. in Lagarde's *Anal. Syr.* p. 86, 9. Assemani's *Bibl. Or.* iii. 1. p. 507, and Badger's *Nestorians*, vol. ii. p. 87 (whether also 368, 371 sq. comp. the passages in Fr. Dieterich's *Comm. de Psalterii usu publico et divisione in Ecclesia Syriaca*, Marb. 1862); also Epiphan. *Hær.* xxix. 7.

prophets of whom those four prophetic books contain nothing; and this great book might also serve at the same time another important purpose which could not be overlooked in the formation of such a collection. For as the true religion which was to be retained, and for the perpetuation of the doctrines and truths of which this collection of authoritative writings was founded, had already been most plainly revealed as regards its claims and its truths in the long history of the nation itself, the necessity was felt of possessing a trustworthy and complete historical work on the times between Moses and Joshua and the destruction of the ancient kingdom. For this purpose there was no work which more deserved to be received into the collection than this Book of the Kings. In fact, with it the whole of the ancient history of the community, from the times of Moses and Joshua to the destruction of Jerusalem, could be comprised almost without a gap; and if it could bring encouragement and invigoration to this later generation to look back to the noble deeds of its forefathers, it must still more serve to instruct it to follow thus in one continuous view the history of all true religion from its first commencement, through all subsequent times, down to the gloomy beginning of the present. On this account the Book of Kings received its place before those of the Prophets.

As the first five books of the nucleus of Sacred Scripture, bringing the records down to the death of Moses, were gradually separated from the rest under the name of 'Books of Moses,' and as they also acquired special importance as the 'Book of Law,' the Book of Joshua was by degrees connected more closely with the Book of Kings. The latter book could readily be divided into three books of nearly equal length, which were then appropriately called the Book of Judges and First and Second Books of Kings.[1] The result was that those historical books which contained the Primitive History of the Pentateuch down to the destruction of Jerusalem were suitably broken up into exactly four books of about the same size as the four books of the Prophets just mentioned. However, we have still a trace of the influence of the original connection of the Book of Joshua with the Pentateuch in the record that a *Mosaic Octateuch* was also spoken of,[2] the Book of Judges, and that of Ruth (separately quoted in accordance with somewhat

[1] The further division into four books of Kings, or (which is very inappropriate) into two of Samuel and two of Kings, is much later; it appears, however, as early as the seventh century, in Jacob of Edessa, comp. his *Two Epistles* (published in Syriac by Dr. W. Wright, *Journal of Sacred Lit.* 1867), p. 19.

[2] E.g. Eulogius in Photius' *Bibl.* cod. 230, p. 285 *b*, ed. Bekk.

later usage), being added to the six. We may add that the books were left exactly in the state in which they were then found, without any scrupulous concern with regard to repetitions or small discrepancies which might occur in them;[1] as, in fact, all scrupulosity and excessive painstaking with regard to Sacred Scripture arose gradually at a much later period.

3. But to these two works, which were alike as regards the main purpose of their reception, as was shown above, there was added further a work of an entirely different character and with another immediate object—*the Davidic Books*, by which no other work can be meant than our present Psalter, with its three fundamental divisions.[2] Many of these lyrics had long been used in the Temple services at Jerusalem, and many more recent ones in the great treasury of lyrics might easily serve the same purpose, and others for edification and instruction. It was also strongly felt, without doubt, that many of the highest truths of the ancient religion, in which it was resolved henceforth to live, had found utterance in this lyric treasury in a more impressive form than perhaps anywhere else. And accordingly, for all these reasons, the happy resolution was arrived at to place the Psalter on essentially the same lofty elevation as the other model writings occupied. In assigning to the collection this high position the same freedom from scrupulous anxiety prevailed. For the work was evidently left unaltered in the form it had assumed under the hands of the best poets and collectors of lyrics, without anxiously asking whether a particular lyric of the hundred and fifty was equally well adapted or not for the highest end of a sacred collection. And the real marvel is in the case of this as well as of the other books that, as already sprung of themselves from the divinest nature and life of this community, they existed without design before they became sacred, the sacredness which they in the end obtained being, therefore, no artificial and designed characteristic. Moreover, there is no difficulty in supposing that the Psalter which then became sacred was exactly the same in extent as we find it ever afterwards. In the first centuries of the New

[1] Such as the repetitions in Judges i. and in the Book of Joshua. All such matters have been discussed in the earlier portions of this work at the places in question. In this respect also the Canon of the Old Testament arose in the same way as that of the New Testament. For in the case of the latter no one enquired when it was being collected after the smaller contradictions which might be found here and there between the different books, and which, important as they were in themselves, were as regards the great object of the collection of no moment whatever.

[2] As early as 1839 I showed in the first volume of my *Dichter des Alten Bundes* that the division of the Psalter into *five* parts was far later and arose from a misunderstanding.

Jerusalem particularly the composition of lyrics, as well as the collection of them, was prosecuted with new zeal, and it was in that period that the Psalter, which subsequently became sacred, received its final form; and there is nothing in it which comes lower down than the time of Nehemiah.[1] And though the Psalter was always subsequently called Davidic from the greatest and earliest of its poets, this title was not for a long time understood in the strict sense it acquired afterwards.[2]

4. But in the last place, Royal Epistles concerning 'Devoted Gifts' were received into the above collection; a book which, for the reason to be given below, was subsequently left out of the collection again, but the name and design of which we are able clearly enough to gather. It was evidently a collection of documents or royal decrees in which the Heathen kings had spoken favourably of the building of the New Jerusalem and its Temple, and had promised votive offerings to the Temple; which we may suppose included gifts for the public sacrifices.[3] There was no wish as yet to receive a history of the New Jerusalem, and thereby a kind of continuation of the early Book of Kings, into this collection of Temple-writings, as the New Jerusalem was scarcely a century old; but a collection of royal decrees issued in its favour appeared quite appropriate to form the conclusion of the new collection of authoritative books; and it is in this case, as to some extent also in that of the Davidic Psalter in praise of the God of Sion, that we first fully perceive that this collection was made in Jerusalem only and was designed primarily for Jerusalem and its Temple.

Though Nehemiah is extolled in that short statement of Maccabees as the author of this first enlargement of the Canon, we need not understand this in the strictest sense of the word. For Ezra was better qualified than Nehemiah to form a judgment as to which were the best books; and he also possessed the proper authority for giving effect to his judgment. He may, therefore, have prepared for this enlargement and have essentially carried it out; and if the public acknowledgment of the addition at some suitable opportunity on the part of the entire community did not take place before Nehemiah's days, the later account may have had good reason for mentioning his

[1] I have always perceived this and in later years have repeatedly and more definitely shown that there is no reason for supposing that we have any Maccabean Psalms in the Psalter, see *Jahrbb. der B. W.* vi. pp. 20 sq.; ix. pp. 95, 172.

[2] The very name τὰ τοῦ Δαυίδ, 2 Macc. ii. 13, points to more than one book and presupposes a work of a composite character; 'words of Korach, Ethan, Asaph and the other Psalms,' are still distinguished from David's Psalms, *Asc. Isa.* iv. 21; and we can see from Lagarde's *Anal. Syr.* pp. 83–87 what great freedom Hippolytus exercised.

[3] Comp. vol. v. pp. 48, 136 sq.

name in this connection. Moreover, according to the constitution of that period, the full legal authority for such an act would belong to Nehemiah as the governor.

From that time the Canon as thus increased was regarded as 'the Bible' of that period, and a passage, for instance, was quoted from the Book of Jeremiah as standing in *the Books*,[1] or, as we say, in the Bible.

The Maccabean Canon.

Thus perfectly appropriate was Nehemiah's Canon, and thus fully is the brief notice regarding it confirmed. By this enlargement of the Canon accordingly once more a noble store of the most important books of the ancient nation had been rescued for all time. But no attempt at fixing the Canon of a considerable number of different works can prove adequate for all future ages, as we may perceive in this very example of Nehemiah's Canon. Though the collection may in general be perfectly appropriate, probably one or another of the different books will turn out to be less necessary for all time; and it may still more easily happen that some works will not be so soon received, because they appear less necessa ry, although when wholly rejected they would gradually be felt to be a great loss. Some works may well have a place on the border line, not appearing to be absolutely necessary for the highest purpose of the collection and yet being important enough not to be excluded. In intrinsic excellence, too, the literary works which become famous and are much read in a nation during the course of centuries cannot be so absolutely separated from each other that they consist solely of those which are clearly the best and of those which are wholly unworthy, but the opinion as to th e necessity, or at all events advisability of the reception of some of them may be divided for a considerable time until at last it is settled. All this which will be repeated subsequently in a much larger extent can be observed thus early if we only pay careful heed. And it was undoubtedly a happy circumstance that in those centuries, notwithstanding the selection of authoritative works now made, some better books from the previous nobler times of the nation were preserved, sustained by the love and regard of at least some chosen spirits of the declining people; it is only too easy, after such a selection has become pre-

[1] בַּסְּפָרִים, i.e. *ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις*, Dan. ix. 2. This use of the term was therefore usual when the Book of Daniel was written, or before the second enlargement of the Canon; a fact of great importance for the history of the latter.

dominant, that all the remaining works of antiquity should gradually perish, and amongst them some deserving of permanent preservation. But in this case there arrived the favourable moment when works of this kind which had long seemed less necessary met with reception in addition to the existing collection, and thus the entire Canon obtained a second great enlargement of lasting importance.

For the works which had been received in the second collection owed their unity and their higher claims to the fact that the largest and most important portion of them came from the times of the second great epoch of the general history of Israel, the few later pieces amongst them only being from the transition period preceding the third epoch. This second epoch brought with it the greatest activity of that power which was from the first the highest in this long national history, the prophetic power; and the activity of this power, working in entirely different directions from that in which it worked when Moses founded the kingdom of Jahveh, had produced literary works also such as no Moses could produce in his day. The great work which we have seen [1] had now long constituted the basis of all Sacred Scriptures had, on the other hand, although only partially composed of actual writings of the first great epoch of the history, merely the primitive period of the nation and the community of Jahveh as its subject, and in it again particularly the Law of Moses as the permanent basis of all its spiritual life; in fact, it was around this Law, as the earliest written basis of all the higher literature of Israel, that all the remaining literary works in it were first collected. As, therefore, the first and fundamental book of the Sacred Scriptures gathered up the highest contents of the first epoch, so this second stratum of Scriptures gathered up those of the second epoch; and the increasing coalescence of the two strata could not be more concisely or more appropriately described than by the two connected names *the Law and the Prophets*, which now came into use. But although in reality the most important and lasting constituents of a sacred literature of the ancient nation as it existed before Christ were thereby in general completely supplied, and although this nation's literature could not again during the course of the third epoch, with its growing want of prophets, easily rise to the pure height of those model writings, the higher flight of the mind of Israel was still not so quickly exhausted; and in the course of these centuries also there were gradually produced a few writings which might appear quite

[1] *Ante*, p. 319 sq.

worthy of being connected with the earlier ones. Moreover, the kingdom of the true religion, as it was developed during those centuries, was confined, in spite of its apparently constantly widening extension, really more and more to Judah and Jerusalem, so that everything of a sacred character had necessarily to assume increasingly a special reference to this narrowed domestic sphere. And when once this tendency had been for a time dominant, it sought naturally expression in the formation of the whole collection of Sacred Scriptures, as the formation of it was part of the most important and active efforts of those years. As, therefore, in this way at least three powerful motives combined to keep alive the progressive formation of the collection of Sacred Scriptures, all that was wanting was a favourable moment in the course of the third great epoch of the history when they might altogether execute the needful work.

According to all indications the commencement of the enlargement of the existing Canon was made as early as the first century of the Greek supremacy, when the third and last portion of the *Chronicles*, under the name of the *Book of Ezra*, was received, evidently for the reason that it was of great importance as regards the sacred history of Jerusalem and accordingly for the continuation of the existing Canonical Books of Kings. But the really favourable moment did not arrive before the time of the Maccabees, once more in reality a great period in the history of the Ancient Community, which still possessed vigour enough to produce much that was of lasting value, and particularly the completion of this second and final enlargement of the Judean Canon. In consequence of the complete revolution in the national habits which was made in the Greek period, the writings of the earlier centuries were rapidly perishing; but this Maccabean rising was once more truly national, and sufficiently justified by the true ancient religion, to have the most intense and active feeling for the renown of the ancient nation in every respect, and also to value highly the best of the writings which were of importance for the religion and the honour of Israel. Thus a new enlargement of the Canon was at that time carried out, consisting partly of earlier writings, which might have been received probably at the first enlargement and the greatness of which had borne the fire of every test and approved themselves more and more as worthy, and partly of more recent books which had been written afterwards, but still appeared to be already worthy of higher distinction and permanent preservation. For unhappily it was already certain that all Hebrew books which were not received into the sacred

collection might easily perish. We can also plainly enough discern the immediate occasion which produced the new arrangement. For we know from the same source to which we owe the above particular account of Nehemiah that the first Maccabean, Judas, re-collected the collection of Sacred Scriptures which had been broken up by the war.[1] This can refer only to the model writings of the collection, which, according to ancient practice, were preserved in the Temple.[2] This collection was destroyed in the destruction which overtook all the sacred things of the Temple; but as soon as Judas reconquered the Temple hill, and restored the sacred things in it,[3] he undoubtedly restored likewise the sacred collection of Temple books. And at this restoration a few writings were very naturally received for the first time, which for some time previously had gradually obtained general high appreciation. The books which were then received were the following seven or eight works:—

1. The three *Books of Solomon* and the *Book of Job*. The latter book and the Book of Proverbs had by that time passed through a considerable history, and might by virtue of their age and intrinsic excellence have been received into Nehemiah's Canon, if the principle had not then evidently been followed of not receiving purely poetic books which only remotely served for instruction in the true religion. It is one of the best indications of the healthy feeling of this period that they were now admitted. The Canticles also had then had, as the text of the book shows, a long history, and appears, as it bore Solomon's name at its head, to have been admitted because it had been preserved as by miracle from such an early time; for it cannot be proved, and is in itself improbable, that it was at this time allegorised and by that means found worthy of reception.[4] The Book of Ecclesiastes (Koheleth), on the other hand, came into the Canon in almost its original condition, because it was then not very old, and it probably found admission because it contained so many fine sayings which were so instructive to the later generations, as well as on account of its having been written in the name of Solomon. In fact, these two small

[1] 2 Macc. ii. 14. We have not the slightest reason for regarding this statement as unhistorical, as it may have come to the author of this epistle like the previous statement from a reliable source.

[2] The relation which we found in earlier times (see *ante*, p. 319) was undoubtedly repeated substantially later, as may be inferred from numerous indications.

[3] See vol. v. p. 311.

[4] Some figures and phrases in the New Testament seem to show that many who then disregarded everything belonging to common history swallowed down the Canticles with something like a holy enthusiasm; but that is not strictly allegory. The first traces of this are met with in *M.* Taanith, iv. 8; but Rabbi Akiba will have defended the book (see below) by means of allegory.

poetic books would never have found admission had they stood alone, and had not been like appendixes to the two larger ones; and we of later times may be glad that such valuable pieces were saved in this way. Similarly in the case of the previous collection the small Book of Lamentations came into the Canon only as an appendix of the Book of Jeremiah. To those four poetical books the Psalter was appropriately added.

2. To these five was then added a prophetical book—that of *Daniel*—which was then quite new, but the prophecies of which had already in one respect been wonderfully fulfilled,[1] and which most vividly represented the spirit of this age, so that it was at once deemed worthy of this high distinction. We can still observe by plain traces that it very early attained higher authority.[2]

3. But now two or three historical books were further added. In the first place, the small *Book of Esther*, which was written a century or a century and a half before, but owed its reception simply on account of the Feast of Purim, which was kept in Jerusalem at this time with new zeal,[3] as it admitted of a reference to Grecian influences as well as to Heathenism generally. In the second place, the *Chronicles*. But of these, the third and last part, the *Book of Ezra* as it is generally called, had evidently been received a century before, *the Royal Decrees concerning devoted gifts*,[4] which formed the conclusion at the previous enlargement of the Canon, being now probably first omitted in its favour. It might more particularly be strongly felt that royal decrees of this kind, as issued by Heathen kings, were not quite adapted to form a part of Sacred Scripture; and as the most essential subject-matter of these decrees had found its way into the closing part of the Chronicles, they might the more easily be omitted at this reconstruction of the Canon. Perhaps a hundred years, however, after the first admission of the Book of Ezra, the second part of the Chronicles was also added, but placed after the other already admitted smaller portion;[5] and therein a complete genealogical book, which was specially important for Jerusalem, had been received. And on this occasion also the question was not anxiously weighed whether the Chronicles agreed in every particular with the

[1] Vol. v. p. 305.

[2] Particularly from the Book of Enoch and the earliest book of Sibylline poems: see my *Abhandlung über die Sibyllenbücher*, pp. 23 sq.

[3] It is plainly observable in the later editions of the Book of Esther that the observance of the Feast of Purim began after our period to spread to other countries, e.g. Egypt, as the later editors sought especially to promote this object; see vol. v. pp. 233 sq.

[4] *Ante*, p. 330.

[5] See further vol. i. p. 196.

narratives in the historical books already received at the first extension of the Canon or not. Much more regard was paid to the amplitude of the accounts; and, as in later times when the four Gospels were received, the wholesome opinion was entertained that the accounts of all the books could some day be reconciled.

This was the second extension of the Canon. By it writings of very varied character were admitted, as was naturally the case with a great appendix. And many of the noblest testimonies with regard to the life and operation of the true religion in the period of its greatest purity were thus fortunately preserved, whilst any increase of the materials for the general history of the nation cannot but be most welcome to us moderns. It cannot, however, be denied that the writings of the later period which were received among these very various additions were not quite equal to the earlier ones in intrinsic excellence, and that thus the Canon of the Old Testament, as it was at last settled, witnesses to the gradual diminution of the purest and mightiest spirit of the true religion. It is equally undeniable that the admission of the Book of Esther, which was now resolved on, was almost entirely owing to the special Judean tendency of these last centuries, as to an unavoidable necessity, and that the admission of the Chronicles was determined chiefly out of consideration for Jerusalem, where this completion of the Judean Canon was effected.

That part of the Ancient Community which was the ruling one from the times of the Maccabees, especially the learned schools in Jerusalem, held fast ever after to this Canon, under the persuasion that none of the other Hebrew-Aramaic books of ancient or more recent times could be compared with these as regards the great subject of the true religion and its laws and customs. The whole collection was soon regarded in these circles as the absolutely sacred one; and even the recollection of the particulars of its formation was so soon lost that two centuries and a half later even the learned Fl. Josephus no longer knows anything certain about it, and in his great historical work is wholly silent about the history of the Canon. It is also very remarkable how tenaciously this succession of the single books of the Canon, which arose in the purely historical manner above described, has survived even in the present Hebrew Bible, so that we can even now tell from it, in conjunction with the other historical traces and remarks, how the whole collection was formed by three stages, and why each book was admitted at its particular time. Moreover, an intrinsically sacred

number, as was thought, was soon obtained, which, from that time, seemed for ever to limit the number of all the sacred books; for when the ancient Book of Kings was divided into the above-mentioned three books, the result was exactly twenty-two books, which was the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, and this number easily came to be regarded as for ever unalterable; so that even as late as the second and third century after Christ it was adhered to in many circles.[1] It also became customary to distinguish three principal divisions of the whole collection, corresponding almost exactly to the three strata in which it had been formed. For, even after the first extension of the Canon, three parts might be distinguished in it, as Law, Prophets, and Lyrics; since the historical books between the Pentateuch and the Prophetic books were intended, in accordance with the highest purpose of the collection, principally to serve to show the operation of the prophetic spirit after Moses also, while the documents added at the end could not in any way be regarded as of equal importance. Besides this, there arose in these centuries the custom of reading every Sabbath in the Synagogues after a portion from the Pentateuch also a portion from one of the Prophets,[2] which was naturally followed by the singing of a Psalm; and at all events, as regards the contents of the books, Law, Prophets, and Psalms were thus always the three principal parts of the whole collection. After the second enlargement of the Canon had taken place, which was, as above shown, attached to the Psalter, it became customary still to call this larger collection briefly *Law, Prophets, and Psalms*;[3] since the Psalter might now be regarded as the first and most important book of the entire third section. At all events, it was difficult to find an appropriate name for this third part with the Psalter at its head, since, as regards subject-matter, it contained widely differing books: hence the title sometimes also ran *Law, Prophets, and the other books.*[4] Not before the first

[1] Thus though not Melito yet the much more learned Origen in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 26; vi. 25, and still later Jerome; Jos. also, *Contra Ap.* i. 8, speaks of twenty-two books, although in this passage he really only wishes to speak of them in as far as they are historical sources. This computation of twenty-two sacred books of the Old Testament was continued longest of all amongst the Greek scholars, even though details were variously given; thus twenty-two books are mentioned, the Book of Esther being excluded, in the so-called Athanasian Synopsis and in Nicephori Stichometria, see Credner's *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, pp. 117 sq.

[2] The earliest evidence of this is met with, Luke iv. 17; Acts xiii. 15, 27; xv. 21; but the custom of reading also from the Prophets in the Synagogues was certainly in existence from the times of the Maccabees. That Psalms were sung in those Synagogues in which it was possible follows from the fact that the same custom prevailed in the Christian churches from the first.

[3] Luke xxiv. 44.

[4] Thus in the original preface to the

centuries after Christ did it become the custom in the Judean schools to call the books of the third division in this its larger form simply *writings* (Kethûbîm), as they contained the direct word of God in a less degree than the Law and the Prophets, whilst it was self-evident that in this connection only sacred writings were in all cases intended.[1] But, instead of calling the whole collection, as it then was, *Law, Prophets, and Writings*, all Sacred Scripture was still more briefly known as *Law and Prophets* after the first two original constituents,[2] or most briefly as *the Law*.[3]

Variations.—The Hellenistic Canon.

But however definitely the number of the sacred books now seemed to be fixed, it was nevertheless in reality by no means rigidly determined previous to the destruction of Jerusalem. The reason of the new variations and tendencies to further addition lay in the brief duration of the rising of the Maccabees and in the growing general disorganisation of these later centuries.[4] The above determination of the Canon proceeded from that division of the nation which in all those centuries of the Hagiocracy remained the most powerful both in the schools and among the people, to which at the end of this period Fl. Josephus still belonged, and which even after the destruction of Jerusalem came again into power under a different form.[5] On this account it seemed to the later Rabbis of this party, with their confused knowledge of the past, that the Canon had been fixed by the men of the *Great Synagogue*, by whom they understood only the most famous ancient teachers of the ruling party.[6] But among those who stood intellectually or even only locally at a distance from this ruling party of the University in Jerusalem,

Wisdom of the son of Sirach; or *Laws, Prophetic Utterances, Songs, and other Sacred Writings*, Philo, *De Vita Contempl.* cap. 3.

[1] All sacred writings are called briefly *αἱ γραφαί*, or as one whole *ἡ γραφή*; but if the three parts are to be distinguished, the first two are something more than this. Hence it was not necessary for Jerome to render the name more plainly by *Hagiographa*. The three names תּוֹרָה נְבִיאִים כְּתוּבִים continually recur in the Talmud, and according to Sanh. fol. 90 *b*, the Sadducees in their disputes with Rabban Gamaliel (*ante*, p. 34) had already used these same three names.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 325 sq.

[3] *ὁ νόμος* is often used in this sense in the authentic works of the Apostle John.

[4] As was described vol. v. pp. 359 sq.

[5] As was shown *ante*, pp. 27 sq.

[6] See vol. v. pp. 168 sq. Fl. Josephus, *Contra Ap.* i. 8, has similarly only an indistinct idea of the age of the latest sacred writings; since Artaxerxes I. is the last Persian king mentioned in them, he supposed that by his time holy men had recorded everything, but that all books written later did not belong to the Canon (comp. also the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* vii. pp. 103 sq.)

there arose in this matter also considerable differences of view, which we can still, at least in part, plainly enough perceive.

In the first place we might expect that the Sadducees, who even before the times of the Maccabees had their own firm convictions, will have made all kinds of objections to the Canon as extended by the other party. We have, it is true, no very old and quite precise accounts of this, as everything concerning the Sadducees is very incompletely recorded; but the Samaritans state that, like themselves, they acknowledged the Pentateuch only,[1] even if they declined to do more in a less hostile way than the Samaritans. When Christ contends with them he appeals to the Pentateuch alone;[2] and other writers make similar statements.[3] It is, however, also improbable that, with their opinions,[4] they should have acknowledged the Book of Daniel.[5] Besides, we know that they were fond of special books of their own,[6] which is always of itself the beginning of a separate Canon.

The case of the Essenes was similar, though in the details for quite different reasons. They did not indeed refuse to accept any of the Sacred Books, but, as they carried out the Law far more punctiliously than even the Pharisees,[7] it is not surprising that they regarded the Pentateuch as holy above all the rest; and it is very remarkable that Philo also, who closely resembles them in many of his opinions, uses the other books much more rarely than the Pentateuch, and does not mention some of them at all.[8] Some books among those last incorporated were, besides, evidently used much less amongst the mass of the people, as we can see plainly enough from the New Testament and other early Christian writings. And it is at any rate remarkable that the Book of Esther is nowhere quoted in the New Testament and early Christian writings, and that it was even omitted from the Canonical books in the ancient Greek Canon.[9] It is still more remarkable that the Book of Ecclesiastes is used neither in the New Testament nor in Philo; the general use of the Chronicles was the more unnecessary, as their important contents were mostly found elsewhere also.

[1] In Abulfatch's *Ann. Sam.* p. 102. 9 sq.

[2] Matt. xxii. 23–33. Christ might otherwise have established his point from the Scriptures much more easily.

[3] E.g. Origen, *Contra Cels.* i. 49, Jerome on Matt. xxii. 24, affirm it but without naming their authority.

[4] See vol. v. p. 278.

[5] And Gamaliel would not then have been obliged, according to the story, *G.* Sanh. fol. 90 *b*, to appeal for a proof of the resurrection when disputing with them merely to the words Cant. vii. 10 [A. V. v. 9] (especially to the word יְשֵׁנִים) among all the *Kethûbîm*.

[6] בספרי צדוקים, *G.* Sanh. fol. 100 *b*.

[7] See vol. v. p. 372.

[8] Comp. vol. vii. p. 209.

[9] *Ante*, p. 337.

The Pentateuch, the Prophets (though not every part of these alike), the Psalms, the first Book of Kings, and portions of the Book of Job and of the Proverbs remained, notwithstanding all extensions of the Canon, until the destruction of Jerusalem the 'Scriptures' which were most used in common life.

But the Essenes liked to use certain books of their own besides,[1] and in this respect also passed the limits which the Hagiocracy wished to be kept. But what is here the most remarkable and the most decisive for the future is that the common people were less and less willing to remain within these restrictions, just as we know from other sources that the Hagiocracy, in spite of all its arrogance and exertions, was able to attain its objects in many respects only very incompletely. For it is unmistakable that in the last period before the destruction of Jerusalem the Canon was again gradually considerably extended, as by the involuntary progressive life and development of the nation of the true religion, just as if a third fundamental enlargement of it was about to take place. In truth, the former enlargement of the Canon was thereby seeking its continuation, and there was still enough healthy feeling left in the nation for this, and, indeed, in some respects, a wholly new and fresh life was infused into it, which did not remain without its great influence on this matter of the Canon. A collection which has become thus extensive may easily grow wider of itself; and whilst, as was shown above, portions of it came less into common use, many other books not until now permanently connected with it appeared to be nevertheless equally valuable. A sacred book was until then considered as sacred rather as a whole simply, more regard being paid to its contents and essence than to its letter and outward extent, and true religion and the deepest edification were more sought in it than anything else: if similar excellences were found in other writings, they were the more easily added to it; and the stream of recent literature was still abundant enough. Such was the case, at least, with the great masses of the people who sought good reading and edification, although the biblical scholars might keep more strictly to the Canon. Of course all these new writings which thus gradually crept in did not in general equal the more ancient in intrinsic excellence; but, on the one hand, these more ancient works were in parts now but

[1] The 'sacred books,' which, according to Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 12, the Essenes used in their oracles, may have been the usual ones, but ii. 8. 6 peculiar ones of their own are intended; comp. vol. v. p. 377. The Book of Enoch is in its latest portions only the work of an author who has many of the characteristics of the Essenes, see my *Abhandlung* on this book, pp. 47, 56.

very imperfectly understood by their readers, whilst the more recent ones were very well understood; and, on the other hand, the contents of the more recent ones were in many respects the most interesting to the readers of that day, and they were already, for other reasons, widely read.

Nevertheless, an important circumstance had to intervene to bring about this introduction of a recent literature which had been gradually approaching irresistibly. This strong movement could scarcely have failed to meet with powerful hindrances in Jerusalem immediately under the eyes of the Hagiocracy; but it was different among the Hellenists. In Egypt and elsewhere among the Hellenists there gradually arose a great desire to translate Judean books, and to read them when translated; and there was hardly an attractive Judean book which was not at once translated. Now, as there was in general greater freedom among the Hellenists, and they felt themselves less restricted by the University at Jerusalem, those translated books which did not belong to the Canon of the biblical scholars were gradually more valued by very many readers, and more or less closely connected with the ancient sacred ones. They could be less easily distinguished in translations from the ancient Hebrew ones, and the latter were not read in the original. Books of kindred subject-matter found their way into the Canon most easily and generally, as, for example, the little Book of Baruch[1] got more and more closely connected with the large Book of Jeremiah; revised and augmented books of the Canon, as the Book of Daniel and that of Esther,[2] were in these quarters welcomed the soonest; books in which lofty divine voices were heard, even if only from the lips of an ancient hero, e.g. of an Enoch and other patriarchal saints, to whom in former times no writings had been ascribed, pleased these readers often all the more; and gradually a book crept in here and there which had not even been translated from a Hebrew-Aramaic work, but was originally written in Greek. The most important of the scholars among the Hellenists who remained conscientiously true to their connection with the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem, like Philo, held aloof from this great and growing introduction of other books, and on this account also were so prone to adhere all the more closely to the Pentateuch, but the desire for such writings was much stronger than they were, and it was thought that honour and esteem for many instructive and edifying writings could be best shown by connecting

[1] See vol. v. pp. 206 sq. [2] As has been shown, vol. v. pp. 486, 233 sq.

them as closely as possible with the ancient sacred ones. The Canon, as thus extended, gradually spread even over Palestine, finding an easy acceptance, at least with those who felt themselves more independent of the Hagiocracy; it was at the same time a sign of the influx of Greek culture and language, and of the gradual decay and disappearance of an adequate knowledge of Hebrew. Hence it is not at all surprising that this Canon was particularly acceptable to most Christians: even the new burning thirst for higher teaching and effective exhortation, which was so characteristic of Christianity, often tried to find gratification from such sources. The New Testament and other early Christian writings still supply us with the plainest idea of this new Canon which was then coming into being. Some of these authors avoid, as if intentionally, the use of such writings as sacred, and only, as if involuntarily, cause us to gather from the figures and words which they use that they were well acquainted with them. Others make a freer use of them, and cite them as sacred; and this freedom of quotation from such writings as sacred clearly increases with the lapse of time.[1]

We may call this the *Hellenistic Canon*. Of course, if by 'Canon' be understood a collection of sacred writings which must have necessarily been first investigated and acknowledged by an official body of learned men, the name is inappropriate: but such a meaning does not necessarily lie in the idea of the Canon; and the whole history of the Canon shows that it was always formed by the general convictions and wants of the people, until perhaps a more definite decision from higher authorities was invoked or otherwise made unavoidable. But if the Canon is fundamentally and intrinsically nothing but a religious standard according to which books are valued and made sacred, we can also speak of a Hellenistic Canon; for the former Canon was now gradually and spontaneously enlarged according to a standard which was becoming decisive to a very large portion of the ancient nation deserving of all respect, that is, the principle of valuing and reverencing as sacred all books in which it was thought mighty words of God or edifying accounts of the struggles for God's cause were to be found, provided they could be regarded as coming from a more ancient, and therefore worthier time: for these two conditions were here held to be necessary, and prevented the incorporation of

[1] I have elsewhere shown in detail on many occasions that in the books of the New Testament a large number of so-called Apocryphal books are used more or less openly as sacred writings. But at all events Paul, e.g., uses them much less than James or Jude.

writings in which the modern author and the modern time were too evident. Here, too, there was therefore a Canon; but it did not reach actual completion, first, because on account of the enormous diffusion of Hellenistic literature in distant countries this or that book continued here or there to be arbitrarily more highly valued; and then still more because, like everything Hellenistic, it was violently interrupted by the destruction of Jerusalem, and totally destroyed precisely in those circles in which it had first been formed, as will be described below.

Till close upon the destruction of Jerusalem, however, the general condition of the Canon was still very favourable to such a new extension. For, as before remarked, the simple-minded of the people sought in the Scriptures simply edification and instruction from the sacred dimness of far-off antiquity, so that they were easily satisfied with any writing that fulfilled this condition. A more superstitious reverence for the letter of the Scriptures as sacred, such as was developed after the destruction of Jerusalem, and reached its culmination in the Massoretic period, was more alien to the nature of the time, and the first beginnings of it scarcely appear. A Greek Bible had not yet been, as it afterwards was,[1] forbidden among the Judeans, and, in spite of the Hagiocracy, intellectual freedom was still large outside the University in Jerusalem. A list of the books belonging to the Canon as it had last been determined doubtless existed, but it was not yet very generally acknowledged and pronounced sacred. Moreover, the books of the Scriptures were not always kept together in one great manuscript, but were often copied singly and disseminated in a separate form, so that fresh writings could easily be appended or otherwise added. Besides, recastings and extensions of an ancient sacred work were still not infrequent in this period, which can, generally speaking, be rightly called the Hellenistic; and the treatment of the several copies was also still very free: things which we can assure ourselves of from sufficiently numerous and unmistakable indications.

Since this Canon was thus completely interrupted during its formation, at a time when as yet a general agreement as to its details had nowhere been arrived at, we are not able to give a list of the books incorporated in it. Their number and character differed widely with the various communities, and even with the wishes of individual readers: and inasmuch as we learn almost all that we know of these books from Christian sources only, as will be seen below, it is on this account also difficult for us to

[1] *Ante*, p. 269.

judge of its condition in detail among the Hellenists. We can clearly see only that the books which were admitted here and there into it were in general more recent than the Book of Daniel. The Books of Baruch and Tobit, however, which were among those most generally read, were from the fourth and third centuries B.C.,[1] and the original Book of the Son of Sirach also was somewhat older than the Book of Daniel.[2] And in general we may be very glad, looking at the matter from a purely historical point of view, that this extension of the Canon was at all events attempted. By its means several books have been finally preserved which would otherwise have been involved in the terrible general destruction which, after the fall of Jerusalem, swallowed up all Judæo-Hellenistic products.

We possess, however, in a remarkable manner, precisely from that time in which this destruction threatened to be completely carried out, a very instructive testimony concerning it from a Judean, namely, the author of the 'Apocalypse of Ezra,' above described.[3] He had himself (as may be with good reason asserted) taken part in the discussion whether besides the twenty-two or twenty-four (as they had begun to compute in some Judean schools) sacred books[4] acknowledged by the scholars there could still be others which, although not publicly to be placed on an equality with them, might still be regarded by their readers as genuine inspired writings. For, under the supposition that all books but the twenty-two or twenty-four were simply profane, his book, in which in the person of Ezra he introduced divine sayings, would from the very first have had no claim to the slightest consideration. The author, therefore, distinguishes from the twenty-four sacred books to be publicly used a large number of others which were only meant for the wise,[5] that is, for private reading and

[1] According to vol. v. pp. 206 sq.; and concerning the relation of the original Book of Baruch to the Book of Daniel, see now especially the *Prophets of the Old Testament*, vol. v. pp. 321 sq.

[2] According to vol. v. pp. 262 sq.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 47 sq.

[4] 4 Ezra xiv. 44–46 is the most ancient testimony for the number of twenty-four sacred books, adopted as the legal one in the Talmud. The reason of this change was no doubt the appointing of the five small books (Megillôth) for the five annual festivals; the Book of Ruth was therefore made a separate book to be read at Pentecost, and the Lamentations, formerly incorporated as an appendix to the Book of Jeremiah, was separated as being appointed for the day of mourning mentioned vol. vii. p. 606 and *ante*, p. 28. In this way the Book of Ruth was at first placed before the Psalter on account of David, and the Book of Lamentations, as being a small poetical book, after Solomon's Song. It became, however, later more usual to append these five small books as those read at the feasts to the Pentateuch with its similar Sabbath-Parashim. See further on this point below.

[5] In the whole of this passage, 4 Ezra xiv., we find the earliest distinction between *public* sacred books, which may also be called canonical, and not public or *hidden* ones, ἀπόκρυφοι, גְּנוּזִים: the latter are not on this account necessarily

meditation, not for public teaching before the people. Therefore, just as God communicated to Moses some things for immediate use in public, others more secretly, not for public use,[1] so Ezra was commanded to keep all that was here revealed to him secret, as having reference only to a far-off future. But Ezra, foreseeing that a generation with darkened minds would come who would not keep the Law, and that the sacred Law (with the other sacred books) would even one day be burnt,[2] prayed God to give him power to reproduce the sacred books; and thus, being supernaturally strengthened, he dictated ninety-four sacred books to his scribes within forty days,[3] twenty-four for public, seventy for private use, among the latter being (as this account of course presupposes) this particular book of Revelations. In this account, therefore, Ezra is looked upon partly as the first restorer and partly as the author of all the sacred books without exception; but from the assumption of the possibility of even seventy secret sacred books in round numbers,[4] it is clear enough how large the number of such books was which were considered to be possible additions to the fixed Canon.

But when such a number of more recent books gradually found their way into the Hellenistic Canon—at one place more, at another fewer—the above-mentioned [5] order of the books was more and more altered. The historical basis of that order was no longer understood, and on account of the great number of sacred books the attempt was often made to place similar ones together. In that case it was most logical to distinguish only two series, prose (historical) and poetical books, among which the prophetic books were placed, and in each of these two series to let the individual books follow chronologically simply.[6] Yet some few books were placed differently at various

bad or profane writings. The Talmud, however, already speaks in a different sense of חִיצֹנִים, *outer*, i.e. strange writings, or such as are to be excluded, never to be used at all, and therefore those to be condemned, among which it reckons Sadducean, Christian, and Heathen works.

[1] The words 4 Ezra xiv. 3–6 allude therefore to such books as the Book of Jubilees (vol. i. p. 201): and in this also lies an indication that this book had then been long in existence, as the words point especially to it.

[2] *Ante*, p. 47.

[3] In imitation of Ex. xxiv. 18. The Ethiopic translation gives here the right reading ninety-four. Epiphanius, who with the Greek learned Christians always preferred to speak of only twenty-two sacred books of the Old Testament, divided the number 94 into 22 and 72, comp. V. Langlois' *Collection des historiens de l'Arménie*, i. p. 406; more forced is the distinction of thirty-six books, *ibid.* p. 407.

[4] *Ante*, p. 43.

[5] *Ante*, pp. 325–38.

[6] This order has become the prevailing one in the LXX. and the Vulgate; Tobit, Judith, Esther here close the historical books, Job is placed before the Psalter as being earlier than David; the Books of the Maccabees are, however, left quite at the end. In Ethiopic Bibles Enoch comes consistently before Job.

times and localities; and an indistinct recollection that these two series were not quite satisfactory, and that there had been a quite different and more ancient division, actually once more led to the distinction of three principal sections.[1] And if the twenty-two books were again more strictly adhered to, the tendency was to divide these into three sections in such a way that the prophetic together with the historical books were described as books of post-Mosaic history (as is in a certain sense possible), and the four poetical books were made into the third division.[2]

3. *The New Testament Canon.*

But whilst this Hellenistic Canon was still in formation, there was already growing up in the special Christian corner of the Ancient Community a literature sustained by the purest spirit of its ancient sacred writings, and yet an altogether new one, which was destined soon to set the world in astonishment by its incomparable excellence; and as in Christ himself the purest and highest attainments which were at last to be revealed and perfected in the Ancient Community appeared with a far brighter radiance than had ever been dreamed of, in the same way the new Christian literature was essentially a production of the ancient nation[3] and, in spite of all the poverty and misery and helplessness in which it arose, immediately surpassed all the old literature by virtue of its own peculiar power and subject-matter. It could and would not surpass what was already admirably and abundantly supplied in the earlier literature; it did not claim to be itself sacred nor to speak through the lips of holy men of old, still less to place itself as sacred in opposition to what was acknowledged to be such; but rather proceeded simply from the most pressing needs of the moment, and was nourished and elevated purely by the loftiness and sanctity of the ancient sacred writings; but it ennobled all the special new things which it had to

[1] In the *Decretum Gelasii* (in Credner's *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, pp. 188 sq.) we have (1) the books in the usual Hellenistic order down to David and Solomon with all the gnomic books, without Job; then (2) the *Prophets* in the strict sense; and (3) Job, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Ezra, and the Maccabees are placed together as *historiæ*.

[2] Thus Jos. *Contra Ap.* i. 8: only he here cuts a poor figure as an historian and thinks of the history in the Old Testament as brought down only as far as Artaxerxes I., because the Book of Esther stood at the end of the second main division in his Bible, comp. *ante*, p. 338. But in Epiphan. also *Hær.* xxix. 9, the γραφεῖα are identical with the στιχήρη, i.e. the four poetical books.

[3] Luke is the only New Testament writer known to us who was a Heathen by birth; but he took earlier New Testament writers in all respects as his models; and, as it is, his two books belong to the New Testament only as historical works, and as such are of less account than the others.

interpret with the lofty clearness and power peculiar to early Christianity, as if the blessed calmness of loftiest assurance had been added to the subjective confidence of the ancient prophetic word, and as if what was sacred of old shone here with a double sacredness. But all this has already been touched on in detail in its proper place.

Hence as soon as this new and quite unexpected and incomparable literature, in which was reflected the noblest possible productiveness of the ancient nation in writings and books, had reached partial completeness in its various strata, and was to a considerable extent properly acknowledged amongst men, it was unavoidable that what was best and most approved in it should become a new Canon to those who believed in the lofty truth which it glorified. None of these writings made pretensions to sacredness when they were first written and circulated; on the contrary, they all simply presupposed the ancient sacred writings and appealed to them; and yet the best of them must at last as surely become sacred and as it were form the final crown of the Old Testament as Christ must come and close the great band of the men of God of the Ancient Community. But this New Testament Canon could undoubtedly be the more easily formed as it was only added as a last extension to the Canon which for centuries had on the one hand been fixed for ever, but on the other was being continually extended.

Now since it was added as this last enlargement, we can trace its formation and development much more clearly than in any earlier case. This last great extension of the original Canon also took its rise amongst the people, the most important of these books, surviving the storms of time, becoming ever more indispensable and more sacred to the hearts of all believers, until among the more learned also a more general agreement arose concerning them and was by degrees established. We still possess some records which enable us clearly enough to perceive this origin of the whole collection. For there have been preserved from about the earlier part of the latter half of the second century fragments of a work which described the various books which might or might not be considered part of the Canon of the New Testament; this *Muratorian Fragment* (so called after its first modern editor) is preserved in a bad Latin translation only, and only in one manuscript with a very uncertain text, but nevertheless it is, as far as it can be made reliable use of, of the greatest importance, as being the most ancient monument of

the kind, and it throws the best light we have on some obscure points.[1] Not much later is the evidence of the *Ancient Syriac* translation of the New Testament, now known to us in its double form of the Peshîto and Mepharsho.[2] It does not contain quite so many books, and furnishes proof that a Christian church, so old and so independent as the Syrian, which was also distinguished for its learning and science, and, besides, was situated nearest to the Holy Land, preferred to restrict itself to the fewest if they were only the most reliable and necessary books. When this translation was made the books wanting in it were certainly hardly considered necessary in any other Christian lands; and later, when they were received in the rest of the Christian church, this Syriac translation had been too long in use among its readers and was too much reverenced for this addition to it to be easily resolved on. And thus it remained as a witness to the extent of the Canon in that early time. But Eusebius[3] also, in his account of the New Testament Canon, translates us into the midst of the time of the formation of this Canon, as he distinguishes so carefully between the universally acknowledged books and the more or less disputed ones, or those recognised only by single churches, and separates these two classes from those to be altogether rejected,[4] and also mentions particularly the individual books belonging to these two classes. And thus the dispute about the acceptance or rejection of this or that book continued till the fourth century, and in some cases even later; but this is not the place to follow that contention any farther; besides, it was not about the principal books at all. We must, however, show that the permanent foundations of a New Testament Canon make their appearance in these early times, and that it was already practically in existence as far as the essentials were concerned.

We must, however, be careful in tracing the history of the

[1] Comp. *Jahrbb. der B. W.* viii. pp. 125 sq.

[2] See on the Mepharsho (Cureton's *Fragments*), *Jahrbb. der B. W.* ix. pp. 69 sq.

[3] *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 25, comp. vi. 13 sq. 25. Among the *homologoumena* he places the four Gospels with the Acts, Paul's Epistles, the First Epistle of John and the First of Peter, and 'if such a view seem correct' the Apocalypse. In the case of the *antilegomena* the most important point is the classes which he distinguishes; he places together (1) the Epistles of James and Jude, the 2nd of Peter and the 2nd and 3rd of John; (2) he distinguishes from these as spurious, i.e. as evidently circulating under the names of those who were not their authors, *Acta Pauli*, *Pastor* (see *ante*, pp. 232 sq.), *Apocalypse Petri*, the *Epistle of Barnabas* (pp. 108 sq.) διδαχαὶ of the Apostles (p. 201); but just as he (vi. 13) adds the Epistle of Clement (pp. 205 sq.), he might here have named many other writings; then he speaks (3) of the Apocalypse, but only because for special reasons (see below) he does not much like it; and (4) 'according to the opinion of some the Gospel according to the Hebrews also may be placed here.'

[4] ἄτοπα καὶ δυσσεβῆ.

New Testament Canon not to start from all sorts of baseless hypotheses, as has been the case so much in the past. So many utterly unfounded ideas have in recent times been formed about the age, origin, and purpose of the primitive Christian writings; and then, of course, the history of the formation of this Canon cannot be rightly conceived. The supposition also is wrong that in the selection of books the only question from the first was whether a work was Apostolic, i.e. composed, or at least approved, by an Apostle, or not. It is certainly true that in later times, in consequence of the immense mass of writings which laid claim to more than ordinary authority, regard was also paid to the fact whether they were Apostolic or not, and that afterwards everything in writing ascribed to an Apostle was the more highly valued; but in the Christian Church a work has from the first never been valued and circulated solely from such human considerations, e.g. whether it had been written or at least approved by one of the Twelve; but from the first the one decisive question was whether it contained the true word of Christ and the true spirit which emanated from him; and on this point the feeling and the judgment of the best Christians could be the less at fault the earlier the time in which they lived. Further, every good and for any really Christian purpose useful work was at first always publicly read in one or more churches without much inquiry being made as to its human origin and relations. Christians were glad to have good Christian truth in the form of a book also, and were wont to read publicly from such books every Sunday. And thus there existed soon hundreds of church books for *reading in public*. But as the greatest diversity existed in this respect, and gradually less worthy writings also found admission into some churches, a more earnest effort was soon made to collect in the best way the most genuine works of primitive Christian literature dispersed abroad, and to separate them from the less good or less necessary writings. This effort in particular was fortunately during the period at which we have arrived so prevalent and so permanently operative that in it the true foundation of a New Testament Canon was already laid. For as yet, indeed, even those writings which rose above the great recent flood of books, and had been more carefully collected, were not considered sacred; a new impulse had to come into operation to raise them to this distinction and place them thus on a perfect equality with the ancient sacred ones. But it is on this very account that this period, especially the latter years of it, is so peculiarly important and decisive on the

question of the New Testament Canon. Hence by starting from it as our basis we are able most clearly to distinguish the three great stages by which this Canon was formed.

1. Almost all the most important, as well as numerically the larger number, of the books which finally formed the Canon were written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and were to a large extent then already widely circulated and extensively read. The Apostolic Age laid in this matter also the true imperishable foundation; Gospels, Epistles, Apocalypses, all these principal forms of the new Christian literature were then already exerting a most powerful and ever-deepening influence; we can still in our day clearly perceive and understand that if genuine Christian literature had not then at once borne its most undying fruits, all further developments of it would have been impossible. But this literature grew up with the greatest difficulty wholly from the region of ordinary Christian life, amidst the innumerable straits and hardships of the earth, despised by the world, and scarcely honoured as it deserved even among Christians themselves. Even the custom of regularly reading such books publicly in the churches had then still to be formed. In the case of gospels such a custom was of itself unnatural. Epistles, on the contrary, were written for public reading; the custom therefore first arose in their case, but even then but slowly.[1] But before all this could be further developed a most violent interruption was occasioned by the destruction of Jerusalem.

2. The great commotions and persecutions, and the years of the destruction of Jerusalem, undeniably contributed very largely to the disturbance and interruption of that first stream of Christian literature; but when the Christian Church, in this greatly altered time, came gradually to look back more calmly on the glorious period of her foundation and the works done in it, there arose also the first urgent desire of more carefully collecting and preserving from threatened ruin the best writings of that time which could still be found. Then also, for the first time, the custom was established of regularly reading the best Christian books aloud at the meetings of the churches, particularly the epistles. The better the Christian churches were, the more eagerly did they then strive to procure the best Christian writings, and exchanged their possessions with one another. Thus the first collections were formed between 80–110 A.D., substantially writings from the period before the destruction of Jerusalem, yet with the addition to the already existing or

[1] According to Col. iv. 16.

partially formed collections of a few from the time after that event. The supreme unity of love and spirit, which in the narrow limits of that time naturally included all Christians in opposition to the world, had the effect, in spite of all the freedom of the individual churches and their distance from each other, that in this matter also a certain uniformity prevailed which extended at all events to the more important and more necessary matters. Let us look at this in detail.

1. [1] The simple desire of collecting the Christian literature found its great and noble object first of all in the *Epistles of Paul*, especially as they were so well adapted for public reading in the churches, and those churches which he himself or his disciples had founded, at all events, welcomed such readings from them. Luke, it is true, when writing his Acts of the Apostles, did not make use of any extensive collection of such epistles;[1] and when at last such a collection was attempted in earnest many of the Apostle's epistles were evidently so irrecoverably lost that they could not be incorporated in it. Yet the Epistle of Clement presupposes the public reading of Paul's epistles, at all events in the churches founded by him;[2] and when the second Epistle of Peter was written, a collection of Paul's epistles was already in very general use.[3] We may safely assume that this collection was as early as 100 A.D. already in existence in fundamentally the same form as that in which it has come down to us; and it is accidental that it is only in connection with Marcion's Canon that we first learn the details as to the number and names of these epistles. In this Canon[4] were included the following eleven epistles in the order given: (1) Galatians; (2 and 3) Corinthians I. and II.; (4) Romans; (5 and 6) Thessalonians; (7) Ephesians; (8) Colossians; (9) Philemon; (10) Philippians; (11) Laodiceans, portions only of the latter (as is expressly stated), but as Marcion arbitrarily shortened the others also, this would not of itself prove much, if we were not obliged, on other accounts, to consider it probable that this was not the original epistle to the Laodiceans, but a much later one.[5] But, excepting this last epistle, the usual collection of Paul's epistles, as misused by

[1] Vol. vii. p. 30.
[2] According to cap. 47.
[3] *Ante*, p. 182.
[4] Epiph. *Hær.* xlii. 9.
[5] The Epistle to the Laodiceans mentioned Col. iv. 15, 16 was, as far as we can now see, early lost, but an Epistle to the Laodiceans and one to the Alexandrians were, according to the Muratorian Fragment, in circulation, suspected of having been written in support of the heresy of Marcion; and they may really have been the work of some one of this school. We may therefore conclude that the fragments of which Epiphanius speaks were by degrees added to the Marcionite Canon of Paul's epistles from this late epistle of a real Marcionite.

Marcion for his new purpose, evidently consisted of the above ten: they were arranged according to their supposed, but not quite correct, chronological order; and the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians, of which we have spoken above,[1] might very well have been already received into the collection about 90–100 A.D.

Such was the condition of the collection from about 100–130 A.D. And yet it may be shown that the earliest collection, long before Marcion adopted the one just mentioned, differed from this latter in two important points. It was arranged purely according to the size of the epistles, as if every other standard of their order had been deliberately rejected: this order has been preserved in the Church, whilst Marcion rejected it, perhaps because the Epistle to the Galatians seemed to him the most important, and because he wished at the same time to arrange them more chronologically. But as the Epistle to the Ephesians interferes with this original order, which is otherwise strictly kept, it follows from this fact also, as well as being certain on other grounds,[2] that this epistle was added later, although Marcion found it already present in his collection.[3]

With the collection of Pauline epistles no other could ever compare: it was felt that none of the Twelve or any other prominent Christian of Paul's time had written such epistles as his. But the proper opportunity of making a smaller collection of important epistles other than those of Paul was found when John had issued his large general epistle:[4] the two epistles of James and Peter,[5] which were of about the same length, were put with it; and thus arose a small Canon of New Testament epistles besides those of Paul, which has been preserved in the Peshîto just in this its original or at least substantial form.[6] They were arranged from the first according to their age, as this was in each case then computed, and in this instance correctly: first, the Epistle of James, because it was known that he first had fallen as a martyr, and his epistle was the oldest in this collection; last, the Epistle of John. We know no reason why this second smaller Canon of epistles may not have been in existence as early as 100 or 110 A.D. But in many ancient MSS. of each of these three epistles it is evident that there was found associated with the epistle of James the in many respects very similar

[1] *Ante*, pp. 190 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Comp. the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1866, pp. 4 sq. The collection of the Catholic epistles is, on the contrary, not arranged according to this principle even as regards the books originally composing it.

[4] *Ante*, pp. 168 sq.

[5] Vol. vii. pp. 450 sq. 462 sq.

[6] With regard to the opinions of the later Syrian scholars comp. also the remarks in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1856, pp. 1486 sq.

one of Jude, and with that of John the two smaller ones of this Apostle: these three smaller epistles were by many connected with the three larger ones, to which there could not really be much objection. But the prevailing opinion long remained distrustful with regard to the necessity of these three smaller epistles: the contents of the two small epistles of John seemed to be too unimportant; the short epistle of Jude also did not seem of sufficient importance, especially as the author did not claim to be an apostle, and was not a man of such universal renown as his brother James. Other reasons for keeping them at a distance were then more arbitrarily sought after. Some tried to prove that they were written by friends merely in the name of John and Jude;[1] others began by degrees to object that as James and Jude were not the Apostles their epistles need not be received.[2] And thus these three small epistles occupied, for a long time, a very unfavourable position, until at last all such doubts, with good reason, altogether disappeared. The case was, however, quite different with the Second Epistle of Peter: it was widely circulated pretty early in the second century, it is true, and we can well suppose that as early as c. 120–140 A.D. it was more generally subjoined to the earlier epistle of this name:[3] still, it plainly did not belong to the original Canon of these epistles, but was incorporated much later, the recollection of this fact being, at least dimly, long preserved, so that in the case of no other book were so many doubts as to its belonging to the Canon so long entertained. Yet we cannot be sorry that the authority of this book also at last came to be acknowledged, since it gives utterance to some truths which cannot be easily found elsewhere:[4] evidently this feeling finally caused a decision in its favour.

In the meantime the three so-called Pastoral Epistles[5] had in most MSS. been closely connected with the Pauline Epistles: it is not to be wondered at[6] that they were so early felt to be indispensable, and were acknowledged far earlier than the Second of Peter. The extensive anonymous epistle which,

[1] 'As Wisdom (the Greek book) was written by Solomon's friends in his honour' is the expression of the *Muratorian Fragment* according to the correct reading *ut*.

[2] This was evidently the meaning of those doubters Eusebius mentions who placed these two epistles among the Antilegomena, which is a needless objection at least as far as the Epistle of James is concerned in view of the evidence of the Muratorian Fragment [?] and the Peshito.

[3] We do not find the 2nd Epistle of Peter quoted it is true in the Epistle of Clement, cap. 11 (where the words have too little similarity with 2 Pet. ii. 6), but undoubtedly in Melito, in the genuine passage which is now printed after the Syriac translation in Cureton's *Spicil. Syr.* p. 50, 5 from bottom; concerning this book of Melito, see *ante*, p. 304.

[4] *Ante*, pp. 180 sq.

[5] *Ante*, pp. 198 sq.

[6] See *ante*, pp. 196 sq.

for the reason mentioned above,[1] was gradually very generally entitled the 'Epistle to the Hebrews,' fortunately met with general esteem tolerably early, at least in the East and in Egypt, and was subjoined to Paul's epistles as well as the case allowed. But there has come down from this time, when this so-called Epistle to the Hebrews and the Second Epistle of Peter were but little received, and when the Epistle of Jude and the two smaller ones of John were still objected to, a special way of denominating and arranging all the epistles to be more highly esteemed by the Church, which has never since been lost, and which, in point of value, can nevertheless be looked on merely as an historical feature of the time. For when the sixteen epistles which were held to be beyond doubt worthy of the higher dignity were placed side by side, and when at the same time the reading of them in public was looked at as the chief object to be served, they appeared to fall into three classes, which might be best distinguished as follows: (1) those which were from the first addressed to the whole Christian Church, or at any rate to extensive countries, and therefore practically to the whole Christian Church; it was seen that they were precisely those three epistles of James, Peter, and John, and they were therefore called the *catholic*—i.e. general—epistles;[2] it may also have been thought that these three men, as belonging to the parent church, had the privilege of thus writing to the whole Christian Church; further, (2) most of the Pauline Epistles might be thought of, on the contrary, as directed primarily only to single churches: but then it at once appeared remarkable that they were all addressed to but seven different churches; this number seven was consequently again considered to be full of meaning, as if the number might not be increased, and as if it nevertheless represented the whole Church, like the seven epistles of the Apocalypse. Finally (3) were distinguished those addressed to individual men: it was, however, naturally held to be important that these latter were written by Paul only, and again only to such public officers of the churches as Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, so that the two brief epistles of John had therefore to be excluded. Thus everything in this connection seemed full of meaning.[3] From that time the same

[1] Vol. vii. p. 476.

[2] But we could also imagine Catholic epistles in the sense that though primarily addressed to individual churches they were at the same time meant for the whole Christian Church, like those of Dionysius of Corinth in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 23, 1 sq.

[3] We can perceive the original meaning of all this plainly enough from the long account of the *Muratorian Fragment*, which lingers on this particularly as a matter of great importance, comp. the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* ix. p. 56. Comp. also *Victorinus Petabionensis de Apocal.* translated by Jerome in the *Maxima Bibl. Patrum*, iii. p. 414 *b*.

grouping of all the epistles, and also the name *catholic epistles*, have been preserved, although the latter became very inappropriate when the two small epistles of John were incorporated. The position of the so-called Epistle to the Hebrews was uncertain when it was first placed among the Pauline Epistles;[1] but it was put for the most part at the end of them, which is clear evidence that it was only after a time that it was definitely admitted.

(2) With the collection of Gospels the case was from the first totally different, since every Gospel was intended to exhaust its subject, and to collect several of them seemed at first rather the business of the special student or the inquirer than a duty of every church. If one Gospel was found inadequate, a new one was drawn up by the use of additional sources, or perhaps several were combined so as to form a new one. Thus the collection of epistles was without doubt earlier of importance for the church than that of Gospels. So that when it nevertheless became the custom to unite several Gospels, as being likewise suitable for public use in the churches, this evinces an uncommonly healthy spirit, which was triumphant in those early days; it was rightly felt that the Gospel history was too important for it to be drawn from a single Gospel only, however widely used, or from a simple epitome of all of them, and that to do it justice it would be best to choose the most trustworthy and instructive of the large number of such books already in circulation and to connect them with one another. In this manner the Gospel of Mark was probably first attached to that of Matthew, but on that occasion shortened to the form in which it was afterwards preserved. The pre-eminent importance of these two Gospels was quite certain: but when the beginning of a collection had thus been made, the desire might be early felt of adding the Gospel of Luke to them, partly on account of its rich contents and partly for the sake of the beauty of its language. But the most important occasion was certainly given by John's Gospel: it was rightly felt that it was on the one hand incomparable in its intrinsic greatness, but on the other of itself totally inadequate: and hence the idea naturally arose of attaching it to a selection from the best of the older ones. When this idea had once been conceived, it followed necessarily that at that time, when the students of

[1] It would have been more consistent to have placed it at least at the end of the epistles to churches, as is really the case in the *Cod. Sin.* and other ancient MSS.; in the *Cod. Vat.* it stood originally after that to the Galatians, but should more consistently have stood before it on account of its size. Thus we can still easily see in this case what crept in last.

this literature still knew with sufficient exactness the circumstances of the extant Gospels and the names of the authors of the most important of them, the particular arrangement of the four should come to be that very one which has ever since been predominantly kept up: Matthew's Gospel was placed first, although it was not then in quite its original form; that of Mark was appended to it, as was already the case in many MSS.; that of Luke, as a later and less independent one, was made the third; and to these three was appended John's Gospel as the latest which supplemented and glorified all the other three.[1] By what hands this arrangement was first made and from what quarter it began to spread we now know as little in the case of the Canon of Gospels as in that of the Canon of Epistles: but when we consider that Ephesus, where John lived so long and died, was, according to all indications, the focus of all the Christianity of the time, that after the destruction of Jerusalem, Asia Minor, and especially Ephesus, became its principal second home, we shall hardly be mistaken if we look there for the most active labours on behalf of this collection of the Gospels. The conjunction of the four Gospels themselves might, according to all indications, have been made as early as 110–120 A.D.

(3) When the Acts and the Apocalypse, as a prophetic book, had been added, i.e. recommended to be used in public with the other best Christian books, the whole Canon was practically complete, and both these things could be accomplished concurrently at Ephesus. At this time when Christianity began to spread on a large scale among so many learned Heathen, many of them liked most of all to read one or more Gospels, especially the Sermon on the Mount and things like it, in order most perfectly to drink in the spirit of Christ himself, attracted by his unique greatness. Nor could it be otherwise than that as in the Old Testament the Pentateuch so in the New the Gospels should gain a special sacredness as the foundation-books of the New Testament. Nevertheless it remained the right and prevailing feeling of this time that Gospels and Epistles formed in a higher sense one connected whole as aids to the understanding of true Christianity in its first pure form, a feeling which could not be repressed for long by the contrary practice of individual men and churches, who, perhaps from an unintelligent and confused

[1] If John's Gospel stands in some ancient MSS. immediately after Matthew or as in the Syrian *Mepharsho* before Luke, this was done solely in order to give prominence to it as more important, just as in other MSS. Mark is placed quite last on account of its apparent unimportance. The position of Mark before Matthew is remarkable but much rarer.

conception of Paul's labours, wished to admit only one or a few Gospels.[1] But if they were combined, a book like the Acts must almost as a matter of course be also made use of, in order to fill up the gap in the history between the Gospels and the Epistles: just as in the Old Testament[2] the great Book of Kings had to fill the gap between the Primitive History and the Prophets. There is, moreover, no doubt that the Acts had at that time been long written.[3] The Apocalypse, it is true, seemed to be less necessary; it was also apparently but little circulated during the time just preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, when it was written, and only became widely known during the new persecutions under Domitian,[4] and it also was plainly received first in Ephesus. If the wish to possess a great prophetic book in a purely Christian form and the confusion of its author with the Apostle gained for it many admirers, its reception was hindered both by the liability of its contents to be misunderstood and the conviction, which was ever and anon more or less clearly cropping up, that its author was not the Apostle: so that in the case of no other book did the state of hesitation last so long. Nevertheless the decision was at last for good reasons given in its favour; so that other Apocalypses, which were in those early times much read, but which were only written in the name of strangers, especially an Apocalypse of Peter,[5] were gradually altogether superseded by this better one.[6]

Of Christian lyrics there was no collection, however small, admitted into the Canon, evidently because none existed which was generally valued. For new truly Christian hymns were written even in the earliest Christian times in great abundance and variety;[7] and soon poems of a lengthy and more elaborate nature were attempted.[8] But a good collection of lyrics was in

[1] Justin Martyr, e.g. who speaks so much of the Gospels, but never refers to a collection of New Testament Epistles: his authority is completely outweighed by that of others already mentioned. In the *Const. Apost.* also the words of the Gospels only are cited from principle.

[2] *Ante*, p. 327.

[3] Comp. also my essay in the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* ix. pp. 49 sq. [*Die drei ersten Evang. und die Apostelgeschichte*, vol. ii. pp. 30 sq. (1872).]

[4] We may at least infer from the very definite statements of Irenæus (*Contra Hær.* v. 30. 3) that it was written under Domitian; from the end of Domitian's reign (which Irenæus particularly mentions) may have been handed down the idea of some who had to speak of him that it was only then written. It scarcely needs to be remarked that the question of its real date is not thereby affected. As to the amount of consideration paid to it in the ancient Church, see also Hilarius in Pitra's *Spicil. Solesm.* i. pp. 165 sq.

[5] See *ante*, p. 251.

[6] Comp. further on many points my essay in my *Johanneische Schriften* ii. pp. 361–439. Also Credner's *Geschichte des NTlichen Kanons*, Berlin, 1860: the defects of this book are noted in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1860, pp. 978–95.

[7] As I have on many occasions shown *Jahrbb. der B. W.* i. pp. 151–154; iii. pp. 256 sq.; viii. p. 82 and elsewhere.

[8] See my *Abhandlung über die Sibyl Bücher*, pp. 79 sq.

ancient times always formed very slowly; and the Psalms of the Old Testament, as the ancient sacred book of hymns, seemed to be still in general sufficient.

3. In this manner, therefore, the separate collections and more approved books of which the New Testament Canon was finally formed were quite ready as early as the beginning of the second century and in its first decades to be elevated to that higher position which was at last everywhere accorded to them collectively. But even if in one particular church, for instance Ephesus, great unanimity already reigned as to the list of the best Christian writings for public use, this unanimity could be but slowly extended, as an established centre was wanting in the Christian Church. Besides, during this whole period there was everywhere the greatest freedom also in matters of Christian literature: new books were still very easily introduced, and obtained sometimes the same honour as those which were already possessed of the higher dignity; individual churches often raised this or that new work which was specially dear to any of them to the honourable position of books to be read in public, and communicated them to other churches for a like purpose, an example of which has been given above:[1] and even such writings as were universally ascribed to Apostles or their disciples were as yet by no means considered to be of equal sacredness with those of the Old Testament.[2] Then came further the new flood of books, inundating and deranging everything, which proceeded from the various smaller Christian parties which were gradually formed,[3] and which were generally so eager to influence others by new and attractive writings.

We must form a vivid idea of the continually increasing confusion in Christian literature which prevailed during the latter half of our period and still later, if we wish to understand the necessity that now at last arose for a strong reaction. It was now for the first time felt strongly how necessary it was more strictly to separate the really best Christian books from the mass of others; it was now realised and ever more plainly seen what an incomparable superiority the books written in the first times of the true Christian spirit possessed, and the best separate collections and otherwise best approved books were sought after with an altogether fresh zeal. But this new

[1] *Ante*, p. 214.

[2] As we can most clearly see from the way in which Justin Martyr speaks of the Gospels: he does not yet look on them as belonging to the Scriptures, comp. *ante*, p. 243.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 118 sq.

impulse of the spirit of Christian insight and independence must have become powerful, and in a short time have taken equal possession of almost all the churches, before the middle of the second century, at the first calm moment after the last great convulsions described above, which separated the whole Christian community for ever from the ancient one. Now, and not before, was the New Testament Canon completed: with the total separation of the Christian Church from the ancient Community, and the perfect independence which it has gained in the world, the Canon of its sacred books comes prominently forward, both as a witness and a firm foundation of its now completed independence in the world, and as the last great extension which both supplies the deficiencies of the old Canon and also completes and concludes it. We can see the advance made toward this end very clearly if we compare Justin Martyr with his disciples: he, converted about 130–140 A.D. in Palestine to Christianity, still thinks and writes altogether on the second of the standpoints here distinguished; his disciples, *e.g.* Tatian, and his contemporaries, *e.g.* Theophilus of Antioch, already practically occupy the third.

The measures which were taken to arrive at this desirable unanimity we can still clearly see from the *Muratorian Fragment*. This is evidently a fragment of a book in which a church informs one or more others what is the opinion entertained in it relative to the Canon; many indications point to Rome. The books which in this church were considered the true and necessary constituents of the Canon were enumerated with a detailed description and statement of reasons;[1] but at the conclusion the others, which were only read at pleasure by some, or which were even to be altogether rejected, were distinguished from them. Thus in this instance also the higher truth was spread and confirmed in the scattered churches by the ancient Christian epistolary method. The previous liberty did not indeed at once altogether disappear, but it was at all events materially narrowed; and a firm basis for the Canon was laid, which after this was never again seriously doubtful.

[1] A closer examination of this *Muratorian Fragment* shows (1) that the author began the Canon with the so-called three *Catholic Epistles* and the Apocalypse as a similar epistle to the whole church, placed next the Gospels and Acts, and concluded it with the thirteen Pauline Epistles; (2) that at the end he discusses the less generally acknowledged books (on which occasion he returns to the Apocalypse) and those to be altogether rejected.

Final Settlement of the Canon amongst Samaritans, Judeans, and Christians.

Whilst the Christian Church, therefore, refused no writing of any high value, and in this period received an abundance of new books of such incomparable worth that in them it gained also a permanent standard for its action and a pledge of its own immortality, the exact opposite of all this was taking place amongst the Judeans. Their scholars not only put all Christian writings under the ban, but they rigorously rejected all Græco-Roman, and with it all Hellenistic literature.[1] Since they conceived an ever greater abhorrence of all that was Græco-Roman as being Heathen, and as this dislike extended to the language and literature of this origin, they were compelled on this account consistently to reject also the Hellenistic books: but the growingly bitter opposition to Christianity exerted the most powerful influence in this direction. They saw that Greek had practically become the sacred language of the Christians, and that Christians valued above everything the whole Greek Bible, often with all the Hellenistic additions that had lately found their way into it: this now gave them ample reason for extending their grave suspicions and even their ban to all these writings. We can easily understand that so great a change could not be suddenly put into effect, but towards the end of this period it was already practically carried out. It was then said that the sacred Law had indeed once been turned into Greek for King Ptolemy, but that the day on which this was done was as calamitous a one for Israel as that on which it had made for itself the golden calf, for the sacred Law could not be at all rightly translated into another language; a position which it was attempted to prove from some egregious mistakes in the translation of the Seventy.[2] Also the customs that had once obtained in the Greek Bible, *e.g.* of writing certain words with golden letters, were now strongly condemned.[3] Just as strictly were all the additions to the Hellenistic Old Testament, of which we have spoken above,[4] condemned: and this could easily be done, as they had never as yet been formally recognised. But the rigid rejection of these books reacted also on their

[1] *Ante*, p. 270.

[2] See *ante*, p. 270.

[3] *Jer.* Mass. Sépher Thora i. 10. It is doubtful whether the Simon, son of Gamaliel, who, according to *M.* Megilla i. 8, allowed the Greek translation of the sacred books, was the father or the son of the one mentioned above, p. 34, but the latter is more probable; but his view never obtained acceptance.

[4] *Ante*, pp. 338 sq.

Hebrew-Aramaic originals. Besides, the great devastations of the former and of the last Roman wars, and the increasing misery into which the ancient nation sank, struck a heavy blow at its whole literature as it had till then been developed; and as now, in addition, the Rabbis thus threw suspicion on those writings, they soon totally disappeared from these circles; their originals also were lost among the Christians, since the greater number of the latter felt a deepening dislike of everything Hebrew-Aramaic as of something Jewish. Only a very few fragments, *e.g.* a few sayings of Ben-Sira (Sirach) were preserved out of this once very large number of genuinely Judean writings among the Jewish scholars, and are quoted incidentally in their later works.[1] Fl. Josephus had been the last who still used portions of the Hellenistic Bible as trustworthy authorities.

But the dread of books which might contain anything offensive to the Rabbinical faith and seductive for the weaker minds threatened in this time of deepest disorder to go still further, and even to attack the Canon as it had been fixed before its Hellenistic period. The whole period now concluded, in which Hellenism and Christianity had been developed, was suspected, and everything seemed in the perishing Ancient Community to be dangerous which did not completely accord with those principles of the infinite sacredness and divinity of the ancient sacred Scriptures which were considered vital in this disastrous time. Thus the multitude of writings of the last centuries were all swallowed up by the deep misery of these times; indeed, weighty voices were even heard seriously questioning whether the Book of Ecclesiastes, with its doubts as to the immortality of the human soul, whether Solomon's Song, with its apparently secular contents, or even the Book of Ezekiel, with its great obscurity in parts, were really fitted to remain in the Canon. In these circumstances it was no less a man than Rabbi Akîba who undertook the defence of these suspected books, and succeeded in defending them with all his characteristic skill and tenacity.[2] It was only by such a great effort that it was possible amongst the Judeans to leave the Canon as complete and undiminished as had been fixed in the

[1] Comp. Dukes' *Rabbinische Blumenlese*, pp. 67 sq. But it is specially in some parts of the Mishna that fragments of older books have been preserved, as I have already remarked vol. i. pp. 201 sq.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 262 sq. But R. Akiba's extravagance is here too exhibited in his extraordinary assertion that the whole world is not worth as much as the day on which Solomon's Song was given by God in Israel: and that while all the Writings (כְּתוּבִים, *ante*, p. 338) are holy, Solomon's Song is the holiest of all. See the discussion of the question, *M.* Jadâim iii. 5.

time of the Maccabees: and if the original texts of the books of the Canon of the Old Testament, at least in this extent, were faithfully preserved during the darkness of the approaching Middle Ages, it is owing principally to the resolution of Akîba and his followers, since the Christians unhappily neglected more and more from that time onwards everything Hebrew as if it were necessarily Jewish. In the arrangement of the books, however, the little alteration mentioned above[1] was made, which, insignificant as it was in other respects, is yet specially characteristic of the Jewish Canon of the Old Testament as distinguished from the Christian one.

As the Jews assert later that many of their books had been destroyed through the Roman wars, whilst in reality they themselves by their attitude towards them had had the greatest share in their destruction, so the later Samaritans say that after Hadrian's death four books which had been held sacred from ancient times were taken from them.[2] But just as among the Judeans at that time a timid falling back on the most ancient sacred books and the banishment of all others prevailed, so the Samaritans seem then to have first abandoned the innovations described above[3] and come to hold quite rigidly to their Pentateuch alone, with the rejection of some books that had already become partially sacred. And nevertheless there afterwards appeared among them the at least semi-sacred *Book of Joshua*.[4]

But the Christians continued to use the Hellenistic books in the way described above, as they had no reason suddenly to conceive a mistrust of them and to regard them in the same way as the Judeans did. And the longer they continued to use books of this class, the more closely did they connect them with the Greek Old Testament, as was shown above. But as a

[1] *Ante*, p. 344.

[2] According to the *Chron. Sam.* cap. 48, p. 246; but Abulfatch's *Ann.* p. 120, 10 sq.; 121. 13 sq. more correctly speak of the time of Commodus. The four books mentioned there are: (1) سفر الخيرة (as we must read according to the MS.) *the Book of Selection*, apparently like ἐκλογαί, *ante*, p. 247, containing a selection of wise proverbs and rules of life; (2) *lyrics and prayers for the different sacrifices*; (3) other *lyrics*, probably for church singing; (4) 'the *Book of the Samaritan priests* who trace their descent from Phinehas, and in which is contained the chronicle of the years of their births and lives' (for راحت should be read ارخت). From that time, it is stated, there has been no ancient Samaritan book but the sacred Law and a similar Chronicle, from which this Arabic *Chron. Sam.* then, cap. 48–50, gives a few extracts. It is another question how far there is anything ancient in the many *Samaritan Songs* edited by Gesenius [*Carmina Samaritana* (1824)], and lately especially by Heidenheim in the *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Eng. Theol. Forschung* [and now in his *Bibliotheca Samaritana* (Leipzig), 1884, onwards].

[3] *Ante*, p. 325.

[4] *Ante*, p. 324.

detailed agreement was never arrived at respecting the single works in this mass of books, great arbitrariness prevailed in the different Christian countries: in Egypt with its multitude of books and love of reading, for example, a much larger number of such books was always in use, as the Ethiopic church, whose founders were Egyptians, shows. But it cannot be denied that a collection of sacred books for general use may become too large and from the unusual variety of its contents inconvenient for the people. To this was added, in the course of the following period, the disadvantage that Jews and Christians came to understand each other less and less on the common ground of the Old Testament, partly on account of the different extent which it already began to assume on either side. As the knowledge of Hebrew was being gradually lost among the Christians, at least of the ruling church, by degrees a few of the most inquiring and zealous Christians, such as Melito, Origen, and others, began to investigate more closely the real extent of the Jewish Canon, and found that one in existence which had been reduced again, as above stated, to the Maccabean limits.[1] These learned Christians again wished to confine the Christian Canon of the Old Testament to the books acknowledged by the Jews: and accordingly lists of three grades were drawn up for the Old Testament as well as for the New.[2] (1) *Canonical* books, of which in the case of the Old Testament[3] the number twenty-two was preserved; (2) *Disputed*, of which were reckoned, besides some New Testament writings, eight Hellenistic books which, though rejected by the Jews, continued to be used by most Christians;[4] and (3) *Apocryphal* books, eleven in number of the Old Testament, with many others of the New, which were but little used amongst Christians and which it would be better not to read at all in public.[5] But these lists were drawn up in the ruling

[1] See Melito and Origen in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 26. 13 sq.; vi. 25. 2.

[2] The oldest and best have been preserved in the so-called *Synopsis Athanasii* and in Nicephorus' *Stichometry*, comp. Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, pp. 117 sq. Much less historical and less admirable are those in the *Decretum Gelasii*.

[3] *Ante*, p. 337.

[4] These eight are: (1) the Books of the Maccabees; (2) the Wisdom of Solomon; (3) the Son of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus); (4) Psalms and Songs of Solomon (comp. vol. v. pp. 301 sq.); (5) Esther (comp. *ante*, p. 337); (6) Judith; (7) Susanna (judging from the number of lines a larger book than the present one, comp. vol. v. p. 487); (8) Tobit. In the New Testament: (1) the Apocalypse (comp. *ante*, p. 357); (2) the Apocalypse of Peter; (3) the Epistle of Barnabas (*ante*, pp. 108 sq.); (4) the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

[5] These eleven are: (1) Enoch; (2) the Patriarchs (comp. *ante*, pp. 252 sq.; (3) the Prayer of Joseph, probably mentioned in the Ascension of Isaiah, iv. 22, as 'Words of Joseph the Righteous'; (4 and 5) the Testament and the Ascension of Moses (comp. vol. ii. pp. 226 sq.; vol. vi. pp. 55 sq.); (6) Abraham, a short book; (7) Eldad and Modad (composed accord-

church only, and, even as it was, the Canon took a slightly different form in the Latin from that it had in the Greek Church, whilst it again took a special shape in each of the more independent churches of Asia and Africa. For all merely learned distinctions rarely reach the masses of the people; and no intermediate position can in actual life be maintained for any length of time. Thus the books placed in the second of the above divisions generally remained undivided from the first in the Christian Old Testament all through the Middle Ages, whilst the rest disappeared more and more in the general Church, surviving in considerable numbers and esteem only in remote parts of the Christian world. But even in that case whatever has been preserved of the Hellenistic Biblical literature is almost entirely owing to Christianity.[1]

And finally it is clear from all this that as in all historical matters so also in the collection of the Canon of both the Old and the New Testament many human accidents have had influence in details, and that it would be foolish to say that every portion of it, however small, must according to absolute law be just as it is, and that everything in it must on principle be of equal value. But these details, and the way in which it may have been changed by the accidents of history, are here ultimately of such little importance that in this region also it is only the higher forces which stand far above accidental circumstances that have determined everything that is essential. The spirit from which

ing to Num. xi. 26 sq.) quoted in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, i. 2. 3; (8) Elijah, comp. my *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 139 sq.; (9) Zephaniah, an Apocalypse of which there is a fragment in Clem. *Strom.* v. 11 *ad fin.*; (10) Zacharias, the father of the Baptist (?); (11) Baruch, Habakkuk, Ezekiel, and Daniel in a quite different form from the canonical one; concerning the 2 Bar. intended here see *ante*, pp. 57 sq. In the New Testament (1–4) περίοδοι of Peter, John, Thomas, and the Gospel according to Thomas; (5) διδαχὴ ἀποστόλων, comp. *ante*, p. 13 but a very brief book; (6) two Epistles of Clement; (7) works of Ignatius, Polycarp, and the Shepherd of Hermas. But it is certain that even in the Vulgate there are differences as regards individual books: in very ancient MSS. Baruch is wanting, and Ezra, Tobit, Esther, Judith are quite at the end in this order according to Vercellone's *Var. Lect.* I. pp. lxxxviii. sq. xciv.

By the inquiries of recent times many writings of this kind that had long been lost sight of in the Catholic Church have again become better known; and it is especially in the churches which were early separated and far remote that they survived. In addition to the Ethiopic church, the books of which may be found enumerated especially in Dillmann's *Beschreibung der Londoner und Oxforder Handschriften*, the Nestorian belongs to the number; comp. Badger's *Nestorians* ii. pp. 82–87; 361–363. The Armenian church considers the books of the Maccabees only as definitely belonging to the Canon, [illegible] definitely other books, as 4 Ezra (Journ. as. 1867, p. 193).

[1] It is at once apparent from these remarks how the contest about the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, which has again broken out in our days, must be set at rest: and I have spoken at length on this point in the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* If they are printed in ordinary Bibles, they ought at least to be distinguished by smaller type and by a better title.

these writings first flowed was still strong and pure enough when its productivity had gradually come to an end not to be deceived as to the essential part of them which was to be for ever preserved in the Canon: and just as [1] the Old Testament books were still regarded as having been collected as a whole by the last prophets, so it was one of the more important effects of the first Christian enthusiasm, and as it were a last breath of the Apostolic spirit, which inspired and guided the collection of those of the New Testament.

[1] *Ante*, p. 49.

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY

OF THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL FROM THE BIRTH OF CHRIST, ACCORDING TO THE ROMAN AND CHRISTIAN ERAS.

(To vols. VI. VII. VIII.; comp. vol. V. p. 495, vol. VI. pp. 149 sq., vol. VII. pp. 37 sq.)

U. C.	ÆR. DION.	EMPERORS	ISRAEL	HIGH PRIESTS[1]	THE NABATÆAN KINGS	PARTHIA
c. 746 to 747		Augustus	The Birth of Christ	Jôazar, son of Boéthus	Obedas	Phraates
750	—	—	Herod dies. Archelaus, Antipas, Philip	Eleazar, son of Boéthus	Aretas	
754	1	—	—	Jesus, son of Si'é		
757	4	—	—	—	—	Phraataces
759	6	—	Archelaus banished. Judæa, together with Samaria, a Roman province. Governor of Syria, Quirinius. Governor, Coponius Marcus Ambivius, Governor Annius Rufus, Governor	Chanan, son of Seth	—	Orodes Vonones I. Artabanus
767	14	Tiberius	Valerius Gratus, Governor	Ismael, son of Phabi Eleazar, son of Chanan Simon, son of Camith Joseph Caiaphas		
779	26	—	Pilate, Governor			
781	28	—	*The Baptist*			
780	29	—	Christ baptised			
786	33	—	*Christ crucified*			
787	34	—	Philip the Tetrarch dies			
790	37	Caius	Pilate deposed; Governor of Syria, Vitellius. Agrippa I. king of North-east Palestine	Jonathan, son of Chanan Theophilus, son of Chanan		
791	38	—	*Stephen* stoned. James, the Lord's brother, bishop. Marullus, Governor *Paul* converted			
792	39	—	Antipas banished. Governor of Syria, Petronius			
794	41	Claudius	Agrippa I. King. Herod II. King of Chalkis Paul's First Journey to Jerusalem	Simon, son of Boéthus Matthia, son of Chanan		
797	44	—	Fresh persecution of Christians in Jerusalem; James, the son of Zebedee, executed; Peter goes beyond Palestine. Agrippa I. dies. Cuspius Fadus, Governor	Eljoênâi, son of Canthéras Ismael, son of Canthéras	—	Vardanes
799	46	—	Tiberius Alexander, Governor. Herod, Steward of the Temple. Queen Helena in Jerusalem. Long Famine Paul's Second Journey to Jerusalem	Joseph, son of Camith Chananja, son of Nebedâi		

[1] See vol. vii. p. 480.

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY—*continued.*

U. C.	Ær. Dom.	Emperors	Israel	High Priests	The Nabatæan Kings	Parthia
800	47	—	—	—	—	Gotarzes
801	48	—	Ventidius Cumanus, Governor; Felix Paul's First Great Missionary Journey			
802	49	—	Herod II. dies; Agrippa II. King of Chalkis and Steward of the Temple			
803	50	—	—	—	—	Vonones II.
805	52	—	Felix sole Governor Paul's Third Journey to Jerusalem. Resolution concerning the Gentile-Christians. His Second Great Missionary Journey	—	—	Vologeses
806	53	—	Agrippa King in North-east Palestine; his dominions increased by Nero A.D. 60			
807	54	Nero	Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians	—	Malchus	
808	55	—	Paul's Fourth Journey to Jerusalem, and Third Great Missionary Journey. His Epistle to the Galatians			
809	56	—	Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians			
811	58	—	Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and that to the Romans			
812	59	—	Paul's Fifth Journey to Jerusalem and his imprisonment			
814	61	—	Porcius Festus, Governor. Paul taken from his prison in Cæsarea to Rome	Ismael, son of Phabi		
815	62	Poppæa Empress	Paul in Rome	Joseph, son of Kabi		
816	63		James, the Lord's brother (the Just), condemned to death. Albinus, Governor	Chanan, son of Chanan		
817	64	—	Paul's Journey to Spain. Great persecution of Christians in Rome. *Peter* crucified	Jesus, son of Damnái Jesus, son of Gamali		
818	65	—	Gessius Florus, Governor. Paul put to death	Matthia, son of Theophilus		
819	66	Poppæa dies	The war with the Zealots breaks out. Great defeat of Cestius Gallus. The kingdom of the Zealots. Josephus in Galilee			
820	67	—	Vespasian in Galilee. Josephus a prisoner	(Phannia, son of Samuel)		
821	68	Nero dies in June. Galba	John of Giskhala. Vespasian in the South			

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY—*continued.*

U. C.	ÆR. DION.	EMPERORS	ISRAEL	HIGH PRIESTS	THE NABATÆAN KINGS	PARTHIA
822	69	Otho succeeds in January, Vitellius in April, Vespasian in December	Simon, son of Giora. Vespasian at the gate of Jerusalem, and his departure to Egypt and Rome			
823	70	—	Eleazar priestly Zealot. Titus in Palestine. Jerusalem and the Temple destroyed in the autumn			
826	73	—	At Easter the fall of Massada. Simeon, Bishop			
832	79	Titus				
834	81	Domitian				
843	90	—	—	—	—	Pacorus
849	96	Nerva				
851	98	Trajan				
852	99	—	Martyrdom of Bishop Simeon	—	Kingdom abolished by Trajan	
854	101	—	Agrippa II. dies. Elkesai	—	—	Chosroes
860	107	—	—			
868 till 870	115 till 117	— Hadrian in August	R. Akiba. Great Jewish insurrections in many parts of Africa and Asia			
874	121	—	—	—	—	Vologeses II.
885	132	—	The appearance of Bar-Kôkheba The war against Bar-Kôkheba until			
888	135	—	The fall of Bæthter. Execution of R. Akiba			
891	138	Antoninus Pius				

We should without doubt be more certain as to several dates of these early Christian times if we only had all the authorities which Eutychius, the Patriarch of Alexandria, made use of in his Arabic Annals. As a proof of this we will only mention the following:—When James the Just, according to i., pp. 326, 337, of these annals, is the first bishop of Jerusalem from the second year of Agrippa until *after* Festus, while twenty-eight years are given as the duration of his office, this is quite correct, save that his death is wrongly placed in the year 66 instead of 63; this is explained from vol. vii. pp. 457 sq. But the chief point is that his entry upon his office is rightly dated. When, further, according to i. p. 337, the crucifixion of Peter is placed 22 years after that of Christ, this number is plainly only a corruption of 32, and is then correct. The Symeon mentioned above, p. 187, was, according to i. pp. 345, 349, bishop from the fourth year of Vespasian into the reign of Trajan for the space of twenty-six years: this may be perfectly correct. Afterwards, it is true, of the bishops spoken of, *ante* p. 186, are mentioned, p. 351, only Judas, holding office seven years, from the sixth year of Trajan onwards, and Zacchæus, holding office seven years from the fourteenth of Trajan onwards.

INDEX.

Aaron, ii. 36, 59, 177–185, 225; his rod or sceptre, 180
Abaris (Avaris), city, i. 351, 393 sq., 395, ii. 11 sq., 85
Abba, as title of the heads of schools, vi. 232
Ab beth din, rabbinic title, vi. 14, 430
Abdèmon, a Tyrian, solves Solomon's problems, iii. 277 sq.
Abdias, ten books of apostolic history under his name, i. 60, vii. 36, 460
Abdon, ii. 364, 366
Abel, town near Beth-maachah, ii. 302 *note* 4, iii. 194; besieged by Joab, 195; subdued by Baasha, iv. 34 *note* 3
Abel-meholah, on the Jordan, native place of Elisha, iv. 81
Abennerig, king of a small kingdom south of Adiabene, vii. 403 sq.
Abgar, king of Edessa, said to have had a correspondence with Christ, vi. 142, vii. 404
Abia, chief of Arab tribe in Mesopotamia, vii. 406
Abiathar, escapes from the massacre at Nob, iii. 91; takes refuge with David, 91; high priest at Jerusalem, 134; offers to accompany David in his flight, 180; sent to conciliate Judah after the death of Absolom, 190; supports the conspiracy of Adonijah, 210; banishment to Anathoth and subsequent fate, 213
Abigail, wife of Nabal, iii. 98; marries David, 99; her position in Israel, iv. 134 *note* 3
Abijah, son of Rehoboam by Maachah, iv. 47; king of Judah, 48; his wars with the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, 48 sq.
Abijam for Abijah in 1 Kings, iv. 47 *note* 9
Abila, capital of principality of Lysanias, vii. 258, 422
Abilene, principality of, vii. 359
Abimelech, son of Gideon, ii. 342 sq., 389 sq.
*Ab*imelech stands for *Ah*imelech in 1 Chron. xviii. 16, iii. 82 *note* 2, 134 *note* 5
Abinadab, son of Saul, falls on Mount Gilboa, iii. 106
Abinadab, the ark in his house at Kirjath-jearim, iii. 126
Abiram, eldest son of Hiel, iv. 40
Abishag, of Shunem, iii. 196, 212
Abishai, son of Zeruiah, brother of Joab, iii. 96; an officer in David's army, 113; his rank and prowess, 142, 148; in command against the Ammonites, 155; proposes to execute Shimei, 181, 190; commands a division against Absalom, 186; marches against Sheba, 193
Abner, Saul's general, iii. 71, 75; at his table, 80; his careless watch over him, 96; espouses the cause of Ish-bosheth, 111; conveys Ish-bosheth across the Jordan, 112; slays Asahel, 114; marries Saul's concubine Rizpah, 115; makes overtures to David, 116; assassinated by Joab, 117; David's lament for him, 117; his power, 266 *note* 4
Aborigines of Palestine, i. 224–32
Aboth. See *Pirqæ Aboth*
Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, later Talmudic Collection of Sayings of the Fathers than Pirqæ Aboth, v. 275, vi. 13; tradition regarding siege of Jerusalem, vii. 555; referred to, viii. 33
Abraham, i. 292, 297 sq., 300 sq., 305, 306–37; his name, 324
Absalom, born at Hebron, iii. 115; David's third son, 171; slays his brother Amnon, 172; flees to Geshur, 172; allowed to return to Jerusalem, 175; reconciled with David, 177; assumes royal state, 177; outbreak of his rebellion at Hebron, 178; arrives at Jerusalem, 182; appoints Amasa his general, 185; occupies Gilead, 185; his fate, 186 sq.; his tomb, 187 *note* 2
Abtalion, a rabbi, vi. 14, 18
Abulfateh's Arabic Annals of Samaria, viii. 84 sq., 95
Accho, or Acco (Ptolemais), iii. 263;

Necho disembarks his troops at, iv. 241; restored by the Ptolemies, v. 236; called Ptolemais, 314; rising of Judeans at, in 66 A.D., vii. 507 sq.
Aceldema, or *Hakeldamá*, vi. 410
Achan and Achor, ii. 249
Achiab, cousin of Herod, prevents him from committing suicide, v. 448; compelled to retire into the wilderness, 452 sq.
Achiachar, mentioned in the book of Tobit, v. 212 *note* 5
Achior, an Ammonite prince in the book of Judith, v. 447
Achish, king of Gath, shelters David, iii. 83; receives David a second time, 100; places him in Ziklag, 101; dismisses him, 104
Acmê, a Judean servant of the Empress Julia, v. 447
Acra in Jerusalem, meaning of name, vii. 582
Acrabat, a city founded by the Idumeans, v. 81
Acrabatene, or Acrabattinê, district of, v. 81; conquered by Judas Maccabæus, 313, vii. 418; military commander of, 529: southern A. haunt of Simon, son of Giora, 568
Acrabit, v. 81 *note* 2
Actium, battle of, v. 426
Adasa, Judas Maccabæus encamped at, v. 321
Addæus, an apostle, journeys of, viii. 104
Addita, Alexander Jannæus defeated at, v. 391
Adiabene, conquered by Shalman, iv. 150, a Parthian principality, vii. 402 sq.; relation to Judeanism, 403 sq.
Adida, a town west of Jerusalem, v. 332 sq., vii. 554
Administration of the kingdom under Solomon, iii. 266 sqq.
Adonai, substitution of, for the name Jahveh, v. 198
Adonijah, son of David by Haggith, iii. 209; his conspiracy, 210; executed by Benaiah, 212
Adoniram, collector of the taxes under Rehoboam, iii. 270 *note* 3; stoned to death, 313
Adôra, south-west of Hebron, Tryphon marches to, v. 333 sq.; subdued by John Hyrcanus, 350
Adoraim, city of Judah, the present Dûra, iv. 45 *note* 5
Adrammelech, son of Sennacherib, murders his father, iv. 188
Adramyttium, Judeans in, v. 239
Adriel of Meholah, husband of Merab, iii. 74
Adullam, cave of, in Judah, iii. 85
Ælia. See *Jerusalem*.

Aenon, near Salim, vi. 198
Agag, king of Amalek, spared by Saul, iii. 58; sacrificed by Samuel, 39
Agabus, Christian prophet, vii. 334, 338, 400
Agapæ of early Christians, vii. 122
Ages of the world, four, i. 257 sqq.; the first two, 261–77; the third, 288 sqq.
Agrippa I., his life before he became king, vii. 236 sq.; as tetrarch, 240 sq.; the part he played in the affair between Caligula and the Judeans, 247; ascends the throne of Herod the Great, 257 sq.; his love of building, 263 sq.; his arbitrary appointment of high-priests, 263; his persecution of the Christians, 267 sq., 270 sq.
Agrippa II., or the Younger, at the court of Claudius, vii. 273; made steward of the temple, &c., and king, 420; his territory increased by Nero, 422; his actions and character, 482; after destruction of the temple, viii. 18; correspondence with Josephus on his 'History of Jewish Wars,' 70
Agrippa, Roman general, friendship of Herod with, v. 436
Agrippias, formerly Anthêdon, restored by Herod, v. 431
Agur, proverbs of, iv. 285
Ahab, son of Omri, reigns twenty-two years over the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 39; marries Jezebel, 39; builds a palace at Jezreel, 40, 71; and a temple of Baal in Samaria, 40; sacrifices to Baal and Astarte, 41; his daughter, Athaliah, married to Jehoram, king of Judah, 63; his tendency to favour heathenism, 65; recalls Elijah after the drought, 69 campaigns against the Arameans in the last years of his reign, 71 sqq.; makes peace with Benhadad, 73; desires to purchase Naboth's vineyard, 74; takes possession of it, 75; is denounced by Elijah, 75; concerts a campaign with Jehoshaphat against Ramoth in Gilead, 75; dies from a wound in battle, 77; in the later representations of Elijah, permits the contest on Carmel, 106
Ahab, prophet among the Babylonian exiles, executed by Nabuchodrozzor, iv. 270 *note* 3
Ahasuerus, equivalent to Cyaxares, iv. 228 *note* 3
Ahasuerus, king, v. 230 *note* 3
Ahava, river, rendezvous appointed by Ezra on the, v. 137
Ahaz, son of Jotham, king of Judah, appoints Shebna his chamberlain, iii. 271 *note* 1; his place of burial 273, *note* 2; iv. 158, 167; age at his acces-

sion, 167 *note* 5; introduces foreign rites and religions, 169; calls in the aid of the Assyrians under Tiglath-Pileser, 160, 170; visits Tiglath-Pileser at Damascus, 171; removes the brazen altar from the temple-court and erects another in its place, 171; his altar subsequently restored by Manasseh, 209

Ahaziah, son of Ahab, king of the Ten Tribes, offers to assist Jehoshaphat in his renewal of the navigation of the Red Sea, iv. 56; reigns two years, 77; consults the Fly-god in Ekron, 112; treatment of his messengers by Elijah, 112; date of his death, 21 sq.

Ahaziah (Jehoahaz), son of Jehoram, king of Judah, iv. 95; visits Jehoram, king of the Ten Tribes, at Jezreel, 97; perishes at Megiddo in the revolt of Jehu, 98; interred at Jerusalem, 98; forty-two of his relatives slain by Jehu at Betheked, 99 sq.; his brothers carried into captivity by the Philistines, 95, 140 *note* 3

Ahiah and Ahimeleck, ii. 415

Ahijah, a priest, in Saul's camp, iii. 36

Ahijah, a prophet, of Shiloh, iii. 301; meets Jeroboam, 304; his message to Jeroboam I., iv. 29, 33 *note* 4; possibly the author of 1 Sam. ii. 1–10, 33 *note* 4

Ahijah, son of Jeroboam I., his illness, iv. 28; and death, 29

Ahikam, son of Shaphan, protects Jeremiah, iv. 253, 275; father of Gedaliah, 275

Ahimaaz, a priest, son of Zadok, carries news to David from Jerusalem, iii. 183; announces David's victory over the rebels, 188

Ahimelech, priest of Nob, iii. 82; supplies David with food and weapons, 83; executed, 90; confused with Abiathar, 134 *note* 5; to be read for Abimelech in 1 Chron. xviii. 16, *ibid.*

Ahinoam, of Jezreel, marries David, iii. 99; mother of Amnon, 170

Ahio, son of Abinadab of Kirjath-jearim, iii. 126

Ahithophel, of Giloh, iii. 176; his treachery to David, 178; his advice to Absalom, 182; his plan frustrated by Hushai, 183; hangs himself at Giloh, 184

Ahura-Mazdâo, the supreme deity of the Persians, v. 39, 48 *note* 3

Ai, its conquest and destruction, ii. 248 sqq.; to be identified with Aiath, iv. 3 *note* 1

Aiath, not far from Bethel, in the kingdom of Judah, iv. 3 *note* 1

Ain, town, ii. 294

Ain, in the district of Jezreel, iii. 103; probably an abbreviation of Aîn Jâlûd, 103 *note* 5

Ajalon, place, ii. 251

Akaba, on the Red Sea, iii. 263

Akîba, Rabbi, his life and work, viii. 42, 45, 261–66; relation to Bar-Kokheba, 281, 284; execution of Christians by, 285, 302; his martyrdom, 293

Akra, in Jerusalem, iii. 123 *note* 5; identified with Millo, 258 *note* 3

Alabarch, the nature of his office in Alexandria, vii. 196; held by Alexander, 196; by a Demetrius, 415

Albinus, Roman governor of Judea, vii. 426, 458, 479; recalled, 483

Al-Chidr, Elijah identified with, by the Islamite nations, iv. 113

Alcimus, appointed high-priest by Lysias, v 319; repairs to the court of Demetrius, *ibid.*; returns to Jerusalem with Bacchides, 320; again seeks assistance from the Syrians, 322 sq.; his intended changes in the temple, and death, 325

Alema, captured by Judas Maccabæus, v. 314.

Alexander, story of his conquest of Darius and advance against Jerusalem, v. 214 sq.; his treatment of the Samaritans, 215, 248 *note* 1, 353; historical value of Josephus' account of, 221; said to have made Samaria tributary to Jerusalem, 228; influence of his conquests in Palestine, 235 sq.; employs Samaritan and Judæan soldiers, 237; view of his history in 1 Macc., 464; representative of highest attainment of Greece, vi. 454 sq.

Alexander Balas, pretended son of Antiochus Epiphanes, establishes himself in Ptolemais, v. 327; makes Jonathan high-priest, *ibid.*; compelled to quit Ptolemais, 329; perishes in Arabia, 330; regard of the Judeans for, 352

Alexander Jannæus, son of John Hyrcanus, becomes king, v. 386; campaigns in the early part of his reign, 387 sqq.; his cruelty to the people, 389; rebellion against him, *ibid.*; victory over the Pharisees, 390; his successes in the east, 391; his death, 392

Alexander, son of Aristobulus, campaign against the Romans, v. 402; executed by Pompey, 404

Alexander, son of Mariamne, v. 438; married to Glaphyra, 439; designated one of Herod's successors, 440; charged with intending to flee to Archelaus, 443; executed at Samaria, 444; appearance of a pretender bearing his

name, 445 sq.; said to have appeared to Glaphyra in a dream, 458
Alexander, the Alabarch, vii. 196; his age, 199; his son Tiberius Alexander, 415
Alexander, Tiberius, governor of Judea, vii. 415; governor of Egypt, 501; fruitless efforts to calm Judeans in Alexandria, 510; Vespasian seeks his co-operation, 573; in the camp of Titus, 578
Alexander Zebina, sent to Syria by Ptolemy Physcon, v. 352
Alexandra (also called Salômê), widow of Alexander Jannæus, v. 392; becomes queen, 393; and reigns for nine years, *ibid.*
Alexandra, daughter of Hyrcanus, and mother of Mariamne, v. 408; applies to Cleopatra to secure the high-priesthood for her son, 424; imprisoned by Herod, 425; her plans for flight defeated, 427; executed, 428 sq.
Alexandreum, a fortress north-east of Jerusalem built by Alexander Jannæus, v. 382; given up to the Pharisees, 394; Aristobulus in, 399; occupied by Alexander, 402; restored by Aristobulus, 403; and by Herod, 414; Mariamne shut up there, 427; refitted by Herod, 435
Alexandria, Judeans and Samaritans in, v. 238, 240 sqq, 249 sqq., 353 sqq., 469 sq., 480, vii. 250 sq.; philosophy of, vii. 197; conflicts with the heathens there, 251 sq., 260 sq., 510; rebellion of Judeans there, viii. 273; destruction of great synagogue of, 274
Alexandrian philosophy, influence of, on the author of the Wisdom of Solomon, v. 480 *note* 1
Alexas, an officer of Herod, marries Salômê, v. 445; action after Herod's death, 449
Alexas, the elder (Alexander, or Helqía), one of the later Herods, vii. 247; succeeds Silas as prefect of Agrippa's army, 273
Allegory, application of, to the Old Testament, v. 257 sqq., 490; its full development by Philo, vii. 219 sq.; in the early church, viii. 115 sq., 132 sq.; amongst the Rabbis, 263
Altar, erected at Bethel by Jeroboam I., iv. 30; destroyed by Josiah, 30, 238
Altar, the brazen, in the temple at Jerusalem, iii. 243; restored by Asa, iv. 50; replaced by Ahaz with a new altar from Damascus, 171; removed altogether from the forecourt of the temple by Manasseh, 209; but subsequently restored by him, 218

Altar, the Damascene, erected by Ahaz in the forecourt of the temple, iv. 171
Altar, the gilded, in the Holy Place, iii. 243
Altars erected before the gates of Jerusalem, defiled by Josiah, iv. 238
Altars, erected by Saul, iii. 44
Altars, to heathen deities, erected by Solomon, iii. 297
Altar-fire, ii. 179 sq.
Alurus, site of a Zealots' camp, vii. 570
Amalek, a place, i. 250
Amalekites, the, i. 108 sqq., 248–54, ii. 43 sq.; campaign against them undertaken by Saul, iii. 37 sq.; his wars with them, 43; David's campaigns against them, 102; sack Ziklag, 104; pursued by David, 105; subsequent conflicts, 149
Amasa, nephew of David, identified with Amasai, iii. 87 *note* 6; appointed Absalom's general, 185; murdered by Joab, 194
Amasai, leader of a troop from Benjamin and Judah, joins David, iii. 87; identified with David's nephew Amasa, 87 *note* 6
Amâth or Amathûs, east of the Jordan, besieged by Alexander Jannæus, v. 388; reduced, 389; made the centre of a district, 403; palace of Herod in, 436 *note* 1
Amaziah, high priest at Bethel, under Jeroboam II., iv. 131
Amaziah, son of Joash, king of Judah, Jerusalem reduced in his reign, iv. 14 *note* 2; conquers the Idumeans, 141; war with Joash, king of the Ten Tribes, 141; length of his reign, 118, 143; his death, 142
Ambivius, M., Roman governor, vi. 64
Amenophis, king, ii. 83 sqq.
Amittai, father of the prophet Jonah, iv. 123
Ammonites, i. 312, 422 sq., ii. 204, 207, 295, 336 sq., 339 sq., iii. 24; Nahash, king of, besieges Jabesh Gilead, iii. 24; Saul's wars with them, 43; death of Nahash, 151; Hanun, king of, ill-treats David's ambassadors, 152; assisted by Hadadezer, 152; conquered, 159; chronology of the war with, 160; remain loyal to David during Absalom's rebellion, 184; pay tribute to Solomon, 296; allied with Damascus, revolt from Israel after the disruption of the kingdom, iv. 25; war of Jehoshaphat with, 54 sq.; spread over Gilead in the reign of Jehoahaz, 121; reconquered by Jeroboam II., 124; pay tribute to Uzziah, 144; conquered by Jotham, 166; revolt from Judah under Manasseh, 214; toleration of, not enjoined by

Deuteronomy, 223; attempts of Josiah to subdue them, 241; take part with Nabuchodrozzor against Judah, 262; oppressed by the Chaldeans, seek help from Judah, 268; subside in the final advance of the Chaldeans, 271; make a last attempt to regain their independence, 277; v. 153; campaigns of Judas Maccabæus against, 313
Amnon, eldest son of David, iii. 170; his outrage on Tamar, 171; is killed by Absalom, 172
Amon, son of Manasseh, king of Judah, his place of burial, iii. 273 *note* 6; length of his reign, iv. 206 *note* 2; moral corruption of the kingdom in his reign, 230 sq.; his attempts to promote heathenism, 232, 237; his fall, 232
Amorites, i. 72, 230, 233 sq., ii. 204–207, 427
Amos, a prophet, went from Judah into Israel, under Jeroboam II., iv. 14 *note* 1, 30, 125; banished from Israel, 131; announces the impending ruin of the kingdom, 133; his anticipations for Judah, 148; predicts the coming of the Assyrians, 153; his survey of foreign affairs, 196 *note* 1; his Messianic anticipations, 203 *note* 2
Amos, book of, iv. 197, 198 *note* 9
Amri, a tribe residing at Mêdebâ, v. 324
Anahita, worship of, among the Persians, v. 40 *note* 2
Anak, sons of, i. 228 sq., ii. 284
Anammelech, son of Sennacherib, murders his father, iv. 188
Anan (Chanan, Ananus, Annas), his sepulchre, vii. 599
Anan, the younger, son of former, his order of succession to high-priesthood, vii. 480; a military commander of Jerusalem, 529; seeks to remedy the evils of the time, 531; seeks to check the Zealots, 560 sq.; his murder, 564
Ananel, made high-priest by Herod, v. 423 sq.
Ananias, son of Onias, an Egyptian-Judean officer, v. 357; assists Alexander Jannæus, 388
Ananja (Chananja, Ananias), high-priest, vii. 480; his influence, 481; played disgraceful part, 483; his party overthrown, 503 sq.
Anathoth, a town, north of Jerusalem, ii. 310 *note* 1, iii. 313; native city of Jeremiah, iv. 234, 273
Ancestors, the first and the second groups of ten. See *Forefathers*
Ancient nations, their peculiarity, i. 2 sq.
Andress, Judean rebel in Cyrene, viii. 273
Andrew, the Apostle, vi. 245, 302
Andronicus, governor of Syria under Antiochus Epiphanes, v. 295
Andronicus, one of the Seventy, vii. 131
Andronicus, son of Messalam, a Judean disputant in Alexandria, v. 354
Angels, germs of worship of, vii. 383
Anilai. See *Asinai*
Annals of the kingdom. See *State-annals*
Annas (Anan, Hanna, and Channa), high priest, vi. 64; a Sadducee, 140; hearing of Christ before, 429 sq.
Annius, Titus A. Rufi filius, Hadrian's governor of Palestine, viii. 286
'Anointed of Jahveh,' position of the king as, iii. 6, 45, 65, 81, 95, 107
Anonymousness of the historical books, i. 56, 61
Anthêdon, a city on the coast south of Gaza, v. 236; captured by Alexander Jannæus, 388; restored by Herod, 431; Agrippa arrested there, vii. 238
Antichrist and Antichrists, viii. 178
Antigonus, of Socho, successor of Simon I., v. 275
Antigonus, son of Aristobulus, v. 402; escapes with him from Rome, 403; takes refuge with Ptolemæus, 404; brought back by him, 408; with the aid of the Parthians enters Jerusalem, 411; assumes the high-priesthood under the name Mattathias, 412; besieges Masâda, 413; defeated at what was afterwards the Herodium, 413, 435; sends an embassy to Machæras, 414; then an army against him under Pappus, 415; gives himself up to Sosius, and is executed at Antioch, 416
Antigonus, son of Demetrius Poliorcêtes, v. 245
Antigonus, son of John Hyrcanus, besieges Samaria, v. 353; position after his father's death, 385; put to death by his brother Aristobulus, 386
Antioch, in Pisidia, Paul's labours there, vii. 345 sq.
Antioch, in Syria, Judeans in, v. 237, 239, 241; Herod accompanies Octavian to, 427; Christianity there, vii. 189; Barnabas and Paul there, 334 sq., 348 sq., 361; influence of Christians there, 508; outbreak of heathen hatred of Judeans at, 510 sq.; the sphere of the labours of Ignatius, viii. 217
Antiochus Cyzicenus, called in by the Samaritans, v. 353; John Hyrcanus said to have foretold defeat of, 384
Antiochus Dionysus, one of the last of the Seleucidæ, opposed by Alexander Jannæus, v. 391

ANT

Antiochus Epiphanes, son of Antiochus the Great, v. 293; his early years as a hostage in Rome, *ibid.*; designates himself *θεός*, 293 *note* 3; visits Jerusalem, 294; and punishes it, 296; boasts of having exterminated the deity of the Judeans, 298 sq.; retreats out of Egypt, 303; marches against the countries of the north-east, 310; his death, 315 sq.

Antiochus Eupator, son of Antiochus Epiphanes, crowned by Lysias, v. 316; campaign with Lysias, 317; is put to death, 319

Antiochus Grypus, son of Antiochus of Sidê, v. 364

Antiochus, king of Comagena, influence on Caligula, vii. 243; Josephus's mention of, 259 *note*; contributes to army of Cestius, 511; to the army of Titus, 543, 578, 597; his end, viii. 22 sq.

Antiochus Sidêtês (Eusebes), becomes king of Syria, v. 338; besieges Jerusalem, 343 sq.; named Eusebes, 344; is killed in the Parthian campaign, 345

Antiochus the Great, transports Judeans from Mesopotamia into Lydia and Phrygia, v. 238; wars with Egypt, 283; overruns Palestine, *ibid.*; agreement with Ptolemy Epiphanes, 284; campaign in Babylonia, 285; conquered by the Romans, 291; his death, *ibid.*; his robberies of temples, 292

Antiochus Theos, marries Berenice, v. 283. See *Theos*

Antiochus the younger, son of Alexander Balas, proclaimed king by Tryphon, v. 331; and executed by him, 334

Antipas, Herod the Great's youngest son, tetrarch of Galilee, vi. 74–80; his opinion of Christ, 344; Christ taken before, 435; goes to Rome, vii. 241; is deposed by Caligula, 242; his death, 242 *note*

Antipas, abbreviation of Antipater, v. 396. See *Herod Antipas*

Antipater, an Idumean, v. 396; his family, 397; devotes himself to Hyrcanus, *ibid.*; wins over the Egyptian-Judean troops, 403; collects seven hundred talents for Cassius, 407; is poisoned by Malich, 408

Antipater, eldest son of Herod, v. 439; sent to the court of Augustus, 440; intrigues against his brothers, 442 sq.; further intrigues, 445 sq.; recalled from Rome and arrested, 447; executed, 448

Antipater, son of Jason, sent by Jonathan as ambassador to Rome, v. 332

Antipater, son of Salômê, denounces Archelaus, v. 451

APO

Antipatris, a fortress built by Herod, v. 431 *note* 6, 435

Antipatris, Schick considers it *Ras-el-'Ain*, vii. 512

Antonia, castle in Jerusalem, formerly called Baris, refortified by Herod, v. 430, 435; mentioned, vi. 39 sq., vii. 382 sq.; siege-works of Titus near, 595, 601; taken by Titus, 601; temple attacked from it, 603. See *Baris*

Antoninus (or Julianus Antonius), historian of Jewish War, viii. 69

Antoninus Pius, his relation to the Judeans, viii. 294

Antony, his arrival in Palestine, v. 410; his friendship with Herod, *ibid.*; quits Syria, 411; favours Herod at Rome, 413; and at Samosata, 415; desires Herod to send him Aristobulus, 424; summons Herod before him, 425; his war with Octavian, *ibid.*; defeated at Actium, 426

Aphærema. See *Ephraim*

Apharsathchites, the, an Eastern tribe deported to Samaria, iv. 216 *note* 1

Apharsites, or Persians, the, deported to Samaria, iv. 216 *note* 1

Aphek, in the north of Israel, Philistine-army encamped at, iii. 103; probably identical with 'Afûleh, 103 *note* 5; its situation, iv. 72 *note* 4; defeat of Benhadad at, 73; victory of Joash at, over the Arameans, 122 sq.; Cestius encamped there, vii. 512

Aphtha, village, vii. 560

Apion, Plistonices, calumniator of the Judeans, viii. 64; Josephus replies to, 72 sq.

Apocalypse, its date and aim, vii. 527, 555; John the Presbyter its author, viii. 156; classification of, 250 sq.; in the Canon, 357

Apocryphas, viii. 344

Apollonia, a city on the coast, v. 236

Apollonius, governor of Central Syria, defeated by Jonathan, v. 329

Apollonius, son of Thrasæus, commander of the Syrian forces in Southern Syria, under Seleucus Philopator, v. 292; under Antiochus Epiphanes captures Jerusalem, 297; defeated and slain by Judas Maccabæus, 309

Apollos, the Christian teacher, educated in Alexandria, vii. 389; the first to refer the Logos-doctrine to Christ, 390; as Gnostic Christian, viii. 133

Apostles, double meaning of term, vii. 129 sq.; the chief leaders of the community, 141; Paul as an Apostle, 287 sq., 313 sq.; their end, viii. 104; as distinguished from Teachers, 191 sq.; Acts of (apocryphal), 244 sq. See *Twelve*

Apostles, book of the Acts of the, its

scope and form, vii. 23 sq.; its historical value and sources, 27 sq.; for whom written, 33 sq.; chronology of, 37
Apostolic Council, vii. 356 sq.
Apries, king of Egypt. See *Hophra*
Aqiba, rabbi, vi. 15, 35
Aqueduct in Jerusalem constructed by Pilate, vi. 67
Aquila, as translator of Hebrew Bible, viii. 268–271
Aquila, Christian convert and friend of Paul, vii. 377 sq.; Paul accompanies him from Corinth to Ephesus, 381
Arab tribes, tributary to Jehoshaphat, iv. 57; attack Jerusalem in the reign of Jehoram, 94; incursions of, in the reign of Uzziah, 145
Arabia, Israelites in, v. 4; Jews residing there after Christ, 4 *note* 7; Judeans in, 240, vii. 300; Arabian districts ceded to Cleopatra, v. 425; Paul's retreat into, vii. 327 sq.
Arabian tradition, i. 20, 33
Arabic book of Maccabees, v. 287 *note* 3, 323 *note* 4, 342 *note* 2
Arabs and Arabian nations, i. 286, 326
Arad, a place, ii. 190, 286
Aramaic elements, intrusion of into the Hebrew language, iv. 280
Aramaic language, the, in use in the new Jerusalem, v. 130; and in Galilee, 181, 182 sq.; general advance of, 181 sqq.
Aramaic-Semitic, or square character, v. 93 *note* 2 *ad fin.*, 132 *note* 2
Arameans, the, i. 311, 384, ii. 302, 318 sq.; David's wars with, iii. 151; defeated by Joab, 155; by David, 156; rising under Rezon against Solomon, 218; traffic of their kings in war horses, 262; revolt from Israel after the disruption of the kingdom, iv. 24; Ahab's campaigns against, 71 sqq.; regain some of their conquests under Ahaziah, 77; Elisha frustrates their incursions, 86; Jehoram's wars with, 94; regain their supremacy over Israel, 120; defeated by Joash at Aphek, 122; form a new kingdom, 155; their alliance with Pekah against Judah, 158, 170. See *Benhadad, Damascus, Hazael*
Araunah, the Jebusite, iii. 163
Arbêla, capital of Adiabene, conquered by Shalman, iv. 150
Arbêla, in Galilee, robbers vanquished at, by Herod, v. 414
Archelais, a city built by Archelaus, v. 456
Archelaus, a Cappadocian king, father of Glaphyra, v. 439; reconciles Herod with his sons, 442; intended flight of Alexander and Glaphyra to, 443 sq.; guardian of the sons of Alexander, son of Herod the Great, vii. 236
Archelaus, ambassador at Rome of Archelaus, son of Herod, v. 456
Archelaus, son of Herod by Malthacê, his successor on the throne, v. 449; exercises royal powers provisionally, 450; intrigues at Rome, 451; taxes paid by him to Augustus, 455; calls himself Herod, 456; married to Glaphyra, 458; banished to Vienne, 456; *Ethnarch*, vi. 76
Archevites, the, an Eastern tribe deported to Samaria, iv. 216 *note* 1
Areius, king of Sparta, sends an ambassador to Jerusalem, v. 245
Areopolis, the ancient Ar-Moab, v. 236
Aretas, an Arabian king, son of Obodas, v. 442; assists the Romans with troops, 453; mentioned, vi. 76; war against Antippas, 78 sq.
Aretas II., Arabian king in possession of Damascus, vii. 328
Aretas, king of the Nabateans, v. 390; his treaty with Alexander Jannæus, 391; compact with Hyrcanus II., 397
Arethusa, a city in the interior of Palestine, v. 236
Argob, an attendant on Pekahiah, iv. 157
Argob, district, ii. 295 *note* 5
Ariel, title of honour of a king of Moab, iii. 142 *note*
Aristeas, author of the history of Job, viii. 63
Aristeas, or Aristæus, book of, v. 244, 249, 252, 256, 259, 270, 432 *note* 1; origin and purpose of, 472
Aristides, Christian apologist, viii. 303
Aristion, mentioned by Papias, as disciple of the Lord, viii. 156
Aristobulus, author of 'Explanations of the Mosaic Law,' v. 259, 357; teacher of the Ptolemy Philomêtor, 488
Aristobulus, brother of Mariamne, made high-priest by Herod, v. 424; and strangled at Jericho, *ibid.*
Aristobulus, grandson of Herod the Great, vii. 237; on bad terms with his brother Agrippa, 238; endeavoured to assist the Judeans, 247
Aristobulus, son of Alexander Jannæus, v. 393; collects an army and captures fortresses, 394; defeats Hyrcanus II. at Jericho, and makes a compact with him, 395; defeated at Aretas, 397; and besieged in Jerusalem, 398; Scaurus decides in his favour, 398; defeats the Arabian army, *ibid.*; presents Pompey with a golden vine, *ibid.*; arrested by Pompey, 399; duration of his reign, 401 *note* 3; carried to Rome, 402; escapes, 403; again taken prisoner, *ibid.*;

set free by Cæsar, 404; his death, *ibid.*
Aristobulus, son of John Hyrcanus, besieges Samaria, v. 353; becomes high-priest and king, 385; his death, 386
Aristobulus, son of Mariamne, v. 438; marries Berenice, 439; designated one of Herod's successors, 440; and executed at Samaria, 444
Aristotle, i. 203; his allusion to the Judeans, v. 247; representative of highest attainment of Greece, vi. 454, sq.
Ark of the Covenant, the, i. 8; its fortunes, 413–18; its removal from Kirjath-jearim, iii. 126; detained three months in the house of Obed-Edom, 127; transferred to Jerusalem, 127; sent back to Jerusalem by David on his flight, 180; its place in the Holy of Holies, 242 sq.; its new lid, 242 sq.; the cherubs, 242 sq.; placed in the sanctuary at the dedication of the temple, 246; removed by Manasseh from the Holy of Holies, iv. 209; and probably destroyed, 209 *note 5*; not restored, v. 170; traditions of, 171 *note* 2
Armenia, Judeans in, v. 393 *note* 3
Ar-Moab, ii. 295. See *Areopolis*
Armoury, in the Lebanon-house, iii. 250 *note* 1
Arms, new style of, introduced by Solomon, iii. 259 sq.
Army, organisation of David's, iii. 139 sqq.; its officers, 140 sq.; its size, 144 sq.; its equipment, 145 sq.
Aroer, town, ii. 394 *note* 1
Aroer, capital of a new Aramean kingdom, iv. 155
Aroer, on the northern bank of the Arnon, ii. 295; iii. 162
Arphad, conquered by the Assyrians, iv. 151
Arphaxad, i. 264, 282 sqq.
Arsenal, erected by David in Jerusalem, iii. 124
Artapanus, ii. 89 sq.
Artashashta, or the Pseudo-Magian Smerdis, v. 105, 121 *note* 1
Artaxerxes I., his Egypto-Persian wars, v. 148 *note* 3; his death, 160
Artaxerxes II. (Mnemon), v. 206
Artaxerxes III. (Ochus), v. 206
Artemion, late Judean rebel in Cyprus, viii. 274
Arts, the, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 42; development of, in Judah under Hezekiah, 192; connected with literature, their decline in the last age of the kingdom of Judah, 286
Arus, a city near Samaria, v. 453

Arza, steward of Elah, iv. 35
Asa, son of Abijah, king of Judah, iv. 49; length of his reign, 22, 49, 52; removes all traces of heathenism, 49; his campaign against Zerah the Ethiopian, 50 sq.; invokes the aid of Benhadad against Baasha, 34, 52; destroys the works commenced at Ramah, 35; fortifies Geba and Mizpah, 35; his death, 53
Asahel, nephew of David, one of twelve officers, iii. 113, 145 *note* 4; his prowess, 143; slain by Abner, 114; buried at Bethlehem, 115
Asaph, a musician, iii. 248
Asaph, appointed over the 'king's park,' v. 150 *note* 3
Asarhaddon I., son of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, conquered Egypt, iv. 214; sent against Elib, governor of Babylon, 214 *note 5*; whether there were two Asarhaddons, *ibid.*; length of his reign, 299 *note 5*
Asarhaddon II., king of Assyria, makes a new settlement in Samaria, iv. 215; his conquests soon lost, 227
Asaridis, or Axerdis, or Asarhaddon, iv. 214
Ascalôn, reduced by Jonathan, v. 329; occupied by Simon, 332; Antipater settles in, 397; palace of Herod at, 436 *note* 2; castle of, added by Augustus to Salômê's domains, 455; its era, 496; Judean rising against the heathen at, vii. 507; Judeans plan expedition against, 530
Ascension of Christ, the narratives of, vii. 78 sq.
'Ascension of Isaiah,' viii. 257-259
'Ascension of Moses,' the, v. 74 *note* 3, 367 *note* 5, 479
Ashdod, a Philistine city, ii. 339; conquered by Uzziah, iv. 143; siege and reduction of, by Tartan, 178; and by Psammetichus, 219; laid waste by Judas Maccabæus, v. 315; reduced by Jonathan, 329; set on fire by Johanan, 339; bequeathed by Herod to Salômê, 450
Asher, tribe of, ii. 291 sq.
Asherah, meaning of the term, iii. 306 *note* 1
Ashteroth (Karnâim), town, ii. 295
Asia, commerce with, iii. 261
Asia Minor, flight of Israelites to, iv. 166; Judeans in, v. 239
Asinai and Anilai, two Judean brothers in Babylonia, vii. 519; their power and downfall, 520 sq.
Askelon, a Philistine city, i. 243 sqq.; resists Uzziah, iv. 143; occupied by the Scythians, 230
Askelonians, i. 249

Asmodeus, name of an evil spirit, v. 209 *note* 3
Asmoneans, the, 306 sqq.; origin of the name, v. 307 *note* 1; palace of, in Jerusalem, distinct from that of Herod, vi. 455
Asôchis, near Ptolemais, attacked by Ptolemy Lathûrus, v. 387; mentioned, vii. 540
Ass, the image of in the temple, ii. 87, viii. 66; for riding, ii. 242, 389; the significance of Christ's choice of for his entry, vi. 394 sq.
Assembly, the Great, traditions of, v. 168 sqq.; its precepts, 195. See *Council, the, of Seventy*
Assembly, the popular, v. 87; meets to consider the question of mixed marriages, 142; held in the temple B.C. 141; and designates Simon prince, 336
Assyrian Camp,' the, near Jerusalem, iv. 182
Assyrian character, v. 107 *note* 2, 488
Assyrian chronology, iv. 299
Assyrians, the, menace Ammon and Moab, iv. 145; their origin, 149 sq.; limits of their power, 150; their divine destiny recognised by the prophets, 153; their war with the Phœnicians, 162; their aid called in by Ahaz, 170; peace hastily concluded with them by Hezekiah, 176; invade Egypt under Sennacherib, 179 sq.; their retreat, 180; occupy Judah, 180 sq.; and menace Jerusalem, 182; their flight, 183; revival of their power after Sennacherib's death, 214; their dominion finally overthrown by the Medes and Chaldeans, 253 sq.
Astarte, altar to, built by Solomon, iii. 297; worship of, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 27 *note* 7; oracle grove of, near Jezreel, 40; temple of, in Samaria, under Jeroboam II., 126 *note* 6; worship of, introduced by Manasseh into the temple at Jerusalem, 208; statue of, removed from the temple by Josiah, 238
Astrology, introduced by Ahaz, iv. 169; revived by Manasseh, 208; Christians censure R. Aquila on account of, viii. 269
Asuerus, in Tobit xiv. 15, vol. v. 72 *note* 3; name used for Varus, 454 *note* 4
Asylum, royal, right of, iii. 214; right of in Sanctuary, vi. 38
Atargateum, the, near Karnâim, v. 313 *note* 7; destroyed by Judas Maccabæus, 314
Athash, use of the, v. 190
Athaliah, daughter of Ahab, marries Jehoram, king of Judah, iv. 63, 95; assumes power in Jerusalem on the death of Ahaziah, 101; her reign, 134; her fall, 136
Athaliah, sons of, iv. 140 *note* 3
Athenians, the, decree honours to Hyrcanus, v. 405
Athenio, an Egyptian general, v. 426
Athens, Paul at, vii. 373 sq.
Athronges, heads an insurrection in Judea against Archelaus, v. 453
Augusta. See *Sebastê*
Augustus, conditions of Herod's vassalship to, v. 427 *note* 3; friendship of Herod with, 436; reconciles Herod and his sons, 440; allows Herod to determine the succession by will, *ibid.*; his advice to Herod, 444 sq.; Herod's bequests to, 450; delays confirming Herod's will, 451. See *Octavian*
Autonomy, demanded by the Judeans, v. 455
Autumn festival in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 27
Ava, Avvah. See *Ivah*
Avaris. See *Abaris*
Avvim, or Avvites, people, i. 230 sq., 242
Axerdis, or Asaridis, or Asarhaddon, iv. 214
Azariah, an officer of Judas Maccabæus, defeated near Jabneh, v. 315
Azariah, high priest before the destruction of Jerusalem, iii. 247 *note* 4
Azariah, high priest at Jerusalem, said to have prevented Uzziah from sacrificing in the temple, iv. 146
Azariah, name of Uzziah before his accession, iv. 143 *note* 2
Azariah, son of Nathan, iii. 296 *note* 1
Azariah, son of Oded, a prophet in Jerusalem in the reign of Abijah, iv. 49
Azekah, a fortress in Judah, iii. 68; captured by the Chaldeans, iv. 273
Aziz, king of Emessa, vii. 266, 422
Azôth, mountain of, near Beer-Zâth, v. 323

BAAL, king of Tyre, iv. 300
Baal, priests of, in Samaria, iv. 40
Baal, prophets of, contest of Elisha with, iv. 106 sq.
Baal, temple of, at Samaria, erected by Ahab, iv. 40; destroyed by Jehu, 100 sq.; at Jerusalem, probably erected by Jehoram, 95; destroyed on the accession of Joash, 136
Baal-berith, god, ii. 342 sq., 381
Baal-hamon, Solomon's vineyard at, iii. 257
Baal-hazor, north of Jerusalem, murder of Amnon at, iii. 172
Baal-perazim, defeat of the Philistines at, iii. 147

BAA

Baal-shalisha, shortened into Shalisha, iii. 257 *note* 3; a man from, brings loaves and corn to Elisha, iv. 86
Baal-zebub, oracle of, in Ekron, consulted by Ahaziah, iv. 78
Balaam, ii. 213–16
Baalah, fortified by Solomon, iii. 259; identified with Baalath, 259 *note* 6
Baalis, king of Ammon, iv. 276
Baanah, officer of Ish-bosheth, murders him, iii. 118, 136
Baasha, assassinates Nadab, iv. 32; becomes king of the Ten Tribes, 33; belonged to the tribe of Issachar, 33; attacks Judah, 33 sq., 52; conquers Ramah, 34; is compelled to retire, 35; his death, 35; buried in Tirzah, 35; fall of his house in the reign of Elah, 8 *note* 1, 35
Bâbâs, the sons of, espouse the cause of Antigonus, v. 416; removed by Costobar out of Herod's reach, 423; and executed, 429
Babylon, belonged to the Assyrian empire, iv. 150; its origin and rivalry with Nineveh, 254; Chaldean settlement in, 254; Israelites deported to, under Tiglath-Pileser, 166; its history after the fall of Sennacherib, according to Eusebius, 214 *note* 5; settlers sent from, to Samaria, 215; independent of Nineveh, 216; Hezekiah's sons carried to, 217; Manasseh prisoner at, 217; its share in the overthrow of the Assyrian power, 253; defended by Nabopolassar against the Scythians, 255; rise of a new Chaldean power in, 256; date of its independence, 299; conquered by Cyrus, 298, 300; first prophetic announcement of its fall, v. 41; prophetic activity during the siege, 46; siege of, lasted some years, 46; its strong defences, noticed by prophetic writers, 46 *note* 3; at length captured in a single night, 51; Judeans transferred to, 355 *note* 3
Babylon = Rome in First Epistle of Peter and early Christian usage, vii. 464
Babylonia, Biblical studies of Judeans there, viii. 321
Babylonian Judeans, the, send assistance to Jerusalem for the temple, v. 111; their fortunes and privileges under Antiochus the Great, 285; in the first century of our era, vii. 519 sq.
Babylonian star-worship, introduced by Ahaz, iv. 169; revived by Manasseh, 208
Bacchides, sent to Jerusalem by Demetrius Sôtêr, v. 320; defeats Judas Maccabæus, 323; defeated by Jonathan at the fords of the Jordan, 325; fortifies

BAR

Jerusalem and surrounding places, *ibid.*; concedes terms of peace to Jonathan, 326 sq.
Bæthter, fortress of Bar-Kokheba, viii. 289 sq.
Bagôas, a eunuch, his promise to the wife of Pherôras, v. 446
Bagôsês, a Persian general, v. 205
Bagris, for Bacchides, v. 321 *note* 1
Bahurim, on the southern border of Benjamin, iii. 116 *note* 3; between Jerusalem and the Jordan, 181, 183
Baka-trees, omens from the rustling of, iii. 147
Balak, ii. 215 sq.
Balas. See *Alexander Balas*
Balator, king of Tyre, iv. 300
Balsam plant, introduction of, iii. 281 *note* 2; in valleys near Jericho, 281 *note* 2, viii. 77 sq.
Ban (curse). See *Excommunication*
Banus, anchorite, exaggeration of the Baptist's tendencies, vii. 532
Baptism, of John, vi. 167 sq.; of Christ, 191 sq., 197, 262 sq.; in the Early Church, vii. 134; over graves, 138; as adopted by the Rabbis, viii. 121; exaggerated importance of amongst Christian sects 122 sq.
Baptist, the. See *John the Baptist*
Barak, ii. 375 sqq.
Barathena, a city near the Euphrates, iii. 153
Bargiras. See *Simon, son of Giora*
Baris, a castle at Jerusalem, v. 112 sq.; enlarged by John Hyrcanus, 382; on the north side of the temple, 386; occupied by Hyrcanus, 395; surrendered to Pompey, 400; Herod retreats into, 411; converted into Antonia, 430. See *Antonia*
Bar-Kokheba, leader of last Judean revolt, his history and aims, viii. 276 sq.; his death, 291
Barnabas, the Levite, as Christian, vii. 133; sent to Antioch by the parent church, 189; introduces Paul to Peter, 331; visits Paul at Tarsus, 324; deputy to Jerusalem, 336; sent to the heathen with Paul, 338 sq.; in Jerusalem again, 355; separation from Paul, 363
Barnabas, epistle of, viii. 107 sq.; new MS. of, 108
Barrabbân, Jesu, concerned in disturbance under Pilate, vi. 68; son of a rabbi, choice between him and Jesus Christ, 435 sq.
Barrack villages, erected by Solomon, iii. 259
Barracks, erected by David at Jerusalem, iii. 124
Barsabas, surnamed Judas, vii. 143;

chosen Apostle with Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, 361
Baruch, a disciple of Jeremiah, assists him in the compilation of a book of his prophecies, iv. 258; reads it aloud in the temple and is arrested, 259
Baruch, epistle of, to the Ten Tribes, v. 209
Baruch, second of, viii. 57 sq.; third of, 126
Baruch, the book of, v. 207 sqq.; relation to the book of Daniel, 52 *note* 3; from a remote community, 131; relation to the Psalms of Solomon, 225 *note* 1
Barzaphernes, a Parthian general, v. 411
Barzillai, of Rogelim in Gilead, assists David in his flight, iii. 185; escorts him back across the Jordan, 191 sq.; his descendants, 216
Bascama, east of the Jordan, Jonathan executed at, by Tryphon, v. 334
Bases, the, in the fore-court of the temple, iii. 244
Bashan, land, ii. 295, 301
Basileo-Theocracy, its nature, iii. 5; its reconciliation with the Theocracy, 200 sqq.
Basin of the king, iii. 97, 272
Basket-feast, the, in Alexandria, v. 358
Bastards, the, in Zech. ix. 6, their origin, iv. 143 *note* 6
Betanæa, assigned to Philip, v. 455 *note* 6
Bathyra, or Bathira, a fortified place established by Herod, v. 437; elders of, vi. 20
Bath-sheba, wife of Uriah, David's intrigue with, iii. 165; mother of Solomon, 168; gains David's support for Solomon, 210; intercedes with Solomon for Adonijah, 212; her influence at Solomon's court, 291
Bêan, tribe of, conquered by Judas Maccabæus, v. 313
Bedan, judge, ii. 364
Beel-zebub, origin of the name, and of its application to Satan, iv. 78 *note* 1
Beelzebul, Scribes express suspicion of Christ being possessed by, vi. 314
Beer, place, ii. 204, 209, 390
Beer-lahai-roi, place, i. 305
Beeroth, a town of Benjamin, iii. 118 *note* 3
Beersheba, a city in the south of Judah, i. 305, iii. 86 *note* 3, 162; belonged to the southern kingdom, iv. 2 *note* 1, 3 *note* 1; Elijah at, 107
Beer-Zâth, defeat and death of Judas Maccabæus at, v. 323
Beitkâd, probably the ancient Betheked, iv. 99 *note* 3
Bel and the Dragon, v. 486 sq., 460 *note* 3

Beletaras, or Balatores, king of Babylon, iv. 149 *note* 5
Belmon, east of Betylûa, v. 476 *note* 3
Belshazzar, or Nabunid, the last king of Babylon, v. 52
Belus, Judeans refuse to restore temple of, v. 241
Benæ-Beraq, near Lydda, viii. 45, 88
Benaiah, son of Jehoiada, commander of David's body-guard, iii. 142; supports Solomon's claim to the throne, 210; executes Adonijah, 212
Benhadad I., king of Damascus, his genealogy, iv. 24 *note* 5; his aid invoked by Asa against Baasha, *ibid.*, 34 sqq.; peace concluded with him by Omri, 38
Benhadad II., king of Damascus, his wars with Ahab, iv. 71 sqq.; defeated at Aphek, 73; besieges Ramoth in Gilead, 73; refuses to surrender Ramoth in Gilead, 75; his attempted conquest of Samaria prevented by Elisha, 87; again besieges Samaria, 90 sq.; is compelled to withdraw, 91; his illness, 93; murdered in his bath, 93
Benhadad III., king of Damascus, conquers cities west of the Jordan from Jehoahaz, iv. 120; compelled by Jehoash to restore them, 122
Benhadad, a general name for Aramean kings, iv. 71 *note* 3; its antiquity and sanctity, 137 *note* 4
Benjamin, tribe of, ii. 281–83; its claim to the dignity of a leading tribe, iii. 48; its territory divided between the two kingdoms, iv. 2 sq.
Benjaminites, join David in the cave of Adullam, iii. 87; at Ziklag, 102; left-handed warriors, ii. 373, iii. 114
Ben-Tabeel, a Syrian pretender, to be set up by Rezin and Pekah as king in Jerusalem, iv. 158
Beqiim, near Lydda, viii. 45
Beraikût, Wâdi, the 'Valley of Blessing,' iv. 56 *note* 1
Berea, the modern Aleppo, v. 319
Berenice, a city in Africa, Judeans in, v. 240, 242 *note* 3; decree of Judeans at, 437 *note* 1
Berenice, Agrippa I.'s mother, vii. 237
Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus, her marriage and death, v. 283
Berenice, daughter of Salômê, married to Aristobulus, v. 439, 442
Berenice, sister of Agrippa II., vii. 421; at Cæsarea, 441; at Jerusalem, 497; relations to Titus, viii. 19; mentioned, 25
Berœa, in Macedonia, Paul at, vii. 372 sq.
Berothah, probably the Venetian Berytos, the modern Beirout, iii. 153 *note* 2
Berothai, a city near Zobah, iii. 153

BER

Bêrytus, in Phœnicia, the inhabitants furnish troops to the Romans, v. 453
Besor, a brook, David and his men at, iii. 105
Bessara, near Gaba, vii. 538
Bethabarah, vi. 198
Bethannabris, place north of the passage of the Jordan, vii. 552
Bethany, two places, vi. 198, 367, 389
Betharamath, v. 436 *note* 2
Beth-aramptha, later Julia Livia, vi. 100
Beth-aven, flight of the Philistines through, iii. 35
Beth-basi in the wilderness of Judea, occupied by Simon and Jonathan, v. 326
Bethchoron, north-west of Jerusalem, vii. 417; Cestius at, 512
Betheked, a village in Samaria, its situation, iv. 99 *note* 3; forty-two of Ahaziah's relatives slain there by Jehu, 100
Bethel, i. 304, 306, 353, 359, ii. 413 sq.; Israelite troops at, under Saul, iii. 30; incorporated in the northern kingdom, iv. 2; golden calf set up at, by Jeroboam, 27; great altar at, destroyed by Josiah, 30; narrative of the prophet who announced its destruction, 30 sqq.; taken by Abijah, 48; sons of the prophets in, 80; Elijah visits, before his ascension, 85; Elisha mocked at by boys on his journey to, 86; became again the chief seat of the Jahveh religion in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes under the house of Jehu, 119; idolatrous worship at, denounced by Amos, 131; re-establishment of the ancient worship of Jahveh at, under Asarhaddon, 216 sq.; ashes of heathen vessels transported to, from Judah, 238; the bones of the prophet at, 238; an embassy sent from, to Jerusalem, about the annual days of mourning, v. 114; fortified by Bacchides, 325 *note* 2; occupied by Vespasian, vii. 572
Bethesda, vi. 282; pool of, iii. 251
Bethgabra, in Idumea, vii. 554
Beth-horon, Philistine marauders at, iii. 33; road from, 172 *note* 1; Upper and Lower, fortified by Solomon, 259; first victory of Judas Maccabæus at, v. 309; Nicanor defeated at, by Judas Maccabæus, 321; fortified by Bacchides, 325 *note* 2
Beth-jesimoth, or Bethjeshimoth, place, ii. 210; vii. 553
Bethkerem, Solomon's parks at, iii. 256
Bethlehem, birth-place of David, iii. 66; in Judah, 85; residence of David's parents, 86; well at, 88; family sepulchre of David at, 115; reservoirs of Solomon near, 253, 256; the Messiah

BLA

expected by Micah to come from, iv. 204 *note* 1; one of the few cities at first occupied on the return of the exiles, v. 80; Christ's birth there, vi. 182 sq.
Beth-maachah, near Dan, iii. 194
Beth-millo. See *Millo*
Bethomes, a fortress, reduced by Alexander Jannæus, v. 390
Bethphage, situation of, vi. 393
Beth-rehob, kingdom of, assists Ammon, iii. 153
Bethsaida, two towns, vi. 72, 252 sq., 349 sq.
Beth-sheân, or Beth-shan (Scythopolis), on the Jordan, ii. 331; bodies of Saul and his sons at, iii, 110; mentioned, v. 315; Jonathan meets Tryphon at, 333; chastised by the sons of John Hyrcanus, 353. See *Scythopolis*
Beth-shemesh, west of Jerusalem, defeat of Amaziah at, iv. 142
Bethso, in Jerusalem, vii. 581
Bethulia. See *Betylûa*
Beth-Zachariah, Judas Maccabæus encamps at, v. 318
Bethzetha, a hill north of Jerusalem, and subsequently connected with it, v. 320
Beth-zur, in the south of Judah, iii. 86 *note* 3; occupied by Syrian troops, v. 311; fortified by Judas Maccabæus, 312; occupied by Judeans, 317; compelled to surrender, 318; fortified by Bacchides, 325 *note* 2; occupied by the heathen party, 327; captured by Simon, 331
Betomesthaim, north of Betylûa, v. 476 *note* 3
Betylûa, a city between Galilee and Judea, v. 476; the home of Judith, 477
Beyrout, Agrippa I.'s buildings, &c. at, vii. 263; residence of Agrippa II., 482; Titus gives gladiatorial games at, 611
Bezek, on the Jordan, ii. 284; muster of Saul's army in, iii. 24
Bible, origin of term, 331, see *Canon*; sacredness of, viii. 312 sq.
Bidkar, appointed by Jehu captain of his body-guard, iv. 97
Bilib, or Elib, governor of Babylon, iv. 214 *note* 5
Bira, Hebrew form of Baris, v. 112
Birthday of Christ, vi. 157
Bishop, James, the brother of the Lord, the first, vii. 171; origin and nature of the office, viii. 204 sq., 207, 215 sq., 222
Bithron, the, probably a mountain ridge, iii. 114 *note* 5
Black Sea, Judeans in Greek cities on, v. 93 *note* 3, 239 *note* 6

Blood revenge, practice of, iii. 117, 118, 173
Boaz, one of the pillars of Solomon's temple, iii. 237
Bocchoris, king of Egypt, ii. 286; length of his reign, iv. 301
Body-guard, of Saul, iii. 75; of Achish, 103; of David, 142, 143, 179; of Absalom, 177; of Solomon, 257; its quarters, 241; commander of the, his position and influence, 75, 142, 270; the king's, at Jerusalem, iv. 135
Boethus, a disciple of Antigonus, v. 275; his development of the Sadducean doctrine, 378 *note* 2
B'ne Kedem (Saracens), i. 253, 314 sq., ii. 213 sq.
Book of Covenants, i. 69–74, ii. 391
'Book of Higher History,' see Translator's Preface; referred to, vi. 271, 424, 428, and often
Book of Kings, iii. 206; the older or prophetic, iv. 59
Book of Koheleth (Ecclesiastes), iii. 252
Book of Origins, i. 74–96, 213, ii. 26–28, 29 sq., iii. 163, 200 *note* 3, 205, 227 *note* 2, 229, 235 *note* 2, 241 *note* 5, 243 *note* 3, 246, 279, iv. 153 *note* 4, 287
Book of Origins, the Great, i. 61–132, 233–257
Book of the Upright, or Righteous, a collection of national songs, iii. 282
Book of Wisdom, composed in the name of Solomon, iii. 318
Bosor, v. 313 *note* 7; captured by Judas Maccabæus, 314
Bozez, mountain ridge of, iii. 33
Bozrah, captured by Judas Maccabæus, v. 314
Brazen serpent, the, destroyed by Hezekiah, iv. 173
Bronze sea, the, in the priests' court, iii. 244
Bronze work, the, in the temple, iii. 235
Brotherhood, Christian, vii. 117
Bubastes, a city in Lower Egypt, iv. 51 *note* 4
Bunni, Hebrew name for *Neqdimon* in Talmud, vi. 260
Burial-places of kings of Judah, iii. 273
Byblos, Greek form of Phœnician Gebal, iii. 226
Byblus, city. See *Gebal*

CABBALA. See *Kabbâla*
Cabul, name of territory ceded by Solomon to Hiram, iii. 292
Cæsar, revokes Pompey's decrees in Asia, v. 404; friendship with Antipater, 405; favours granted to the Judeans, 405 sq.; consequences of the murder of, 407 sq.
Cæsarea Philippi, v. 236 *note* 4, vi. 72; Christ's approach towards, 350 distinguished by Agrippa as tetrarch, vii. 241; capital of Agrippa II., 420; his minister Philip there, 509. See *Paneas*
Cæsarea-on-the-Sea, iii. 263; formerly Stratônos Pyrgos, v. 236; its erection by Herod, 430 sq.; Herod's palace at, 436 *note* 2; residence of a Roman governor, vi. 37 sq.; contention between Judeans and heathens at, vii. 423 sq., 495 sq., 506; receives the name *Colonia Prima Flavia*, viii. 82; overthrown by earthquake, 282
Caiaphas, high priest, 64; his advice to Sanhedrîn, vi. 374; persecutes the Apostles, vii. 151 sq.
Cain, Cainan, i. 264 sq.
Caius Caligula, his relations with Herod Agrippa I., vii. 239 sq.; his follies towards Jerusalem, 243 sq.; towards Judeans of Alexandra, 250 sq.
Calah (Gen. x. 11), identical with Halah, iv. 165 *note* 2
Caldrons used in the temple, iii. 244
Caleb, ii. 285 sq.
Calebite, Nabal, the, iii. 97
Calendar of public festivities drawn up by the Pharisees, v. 381, 468
Calf, golden, ii. 183
Calf, worship of the, established at Dan and Bethel by Jeroboam I., iv. 26 sq.; subsequently confused with Astarte, 27 *note* 7; how regarded by the prophets, 65
Callimander, a general of Ptolemy Lathûrus, v. 353
Callirrhoë, near the Dead Sea, Herod at, v. 448
Calno, on the Tigris, conquered by the Assyrians, iv. 150
Cambyses, succeeds Cyrus, v. 105; duration of his reign, *ibid.*; his campaigns against Egypt, 106, 116
'Camp,' 'the Assyrian,' near Jerusalem, iv. 182
Cana, v. 391, 426 *note* 2, vi. 180, 247 sq.; miracle at, 250 sq.
Canaan, conquest of, ii. 239–243; division among the conquerors, 255–261; devastated by the Scythians, iv. 230
Canaanite sacrifice of the king of Moab, iv. 89
Canaanites, i. 232–42; in the narrower sense, 236 sq., 244; their new rising, ii. 415 sq.; their relation to Israel, iii. 138; employed in the works for the temple, 230; toleration of, not enjoined by Deuteronomy, iv. 223
Candace, queen of Ethiopia, frequency of name, vii. 183

CAN

Candlesticks, the, in the Holy Place, iii. 243
Canon, of Sacred Scriptures, meaning and origin of, viii. 322 sq.; of Old Testament, 319 sq.; of Hellenists, 338 sq.; of New Testament, 346 sq.; final settlement of, 360 sq.
Cantata, a Hebrew, iv. 42
Canticles, the, composed soon after Solomon's era, iii. 165, 257, 265, 282, 291, iv. 9 *note* 1; age and nature of the poem, 42 sq.; allegorised, viii. 334
Caparetæa, viii. 91
Capernaum, vi. 180, 252, 286, 305, 340 sq., 355 sq.; Josephus at, vii. 542
Capharabin, fortified town, vii. 573
Caphar Barucha, a city of Judah, iv. 56 *note* 1
Caphar-saba, trench from Joppa to, constructed by Jannæus, v. 391; city of Antipatris erected at, by Herod, 435
Capharsalama, victory of Judas Maccabæus at, v. 321
Capharteramim, small town in southern Idumea, vii. 572
Caphartoba, in Idumea, vii. 554
Caphtor, country, i. 245 sq.
Capito. See *Herennius*
Captivity, sufferings of Israel during the, v. 1 sqq.; its duration as anticipated by Jeremiah, 11 sq.; chronology of the, 72–74
Capyrôn, the, the army of Aretas defeated at, by Aristobulus, v. 398
Caravanserai established in Solomon's reign, iii. 262
Carchemish, on the Euphrates, conquered by the Assyrians, iv. 150; occupied by Necho, 257; Necho defeated at, 258
Carians, i. 248, iv. 135 *note* 3
Carmel, a city in southern Judah, iii. 38, 86 *note* 3
Carmel, a hill near Maon, Nabal's herds on, iii. 97
Carmel, Mount, on the shores of the Mediterranean, Elijah's retirement to, iv. 68; contest with the prophets of Baal on, 106
Carnaim. See *Karnâim*
Casiphia, situation of, v. 137 *note* 4; Levites from, join Ezra, 138
Casi, v. 313 *note* 7
Cassius, defeats the Judeans, v. 403; his levies after the death of Cæsar, 407 sq.
Castle of Antonia, its position, iii. 232 *note* 5
Catholic Church, viii. 170–72
Catholic Epistles, viii. 354
Cavalry, introduced by Solomon, iii. 260; supplied from Egypt, iv. 219
Cave-dwellers, in the Egyptian army, invading Judah, iv. 46
Cedrôn, a fortress erected by Cendebæus, v. 339

CHA

Cendebæus, a Syrian general, despatched against Simon, v. 339
Census of the people, ii. 195–97, 275–77; in David's reign, iii. 160 sqq.; of Israel, taken during the reign of Jeroboam II., iv. 124; under the Romans, vi. 43, 62; revolt against, 53; whether two? 155 sq.
Cephar-Charoba, viii. 291
Cephas. Cephas-party. See *Peter*.
Cepheus, king, ii. 90
Cerethites. See *Crete*
Cerinthus, founder of heretical sect, viii. 136 sq.; John meets with, 158
Cestius Gallus, Syrian governor at Jerusalem, vii. 495; appealed to at beginning of revolt of Judeans, 501; his attack upon Jerusalem and defeat, 511 sq.; his successor, 542
Chaboras, a river in Mesopotamia, iv. 150, 264 *note* 7
Chæremon, ii. 85 sq.
Chalcis, principality of, near northern Lebanon, vii. 259; conferred on Agrippa II., 420
Chalcol, a sage, one of the sons of Mahol, iii. 278
Chaldean names, adopted by the Israelites, v. 33; of the months, 183
Chaldean philosophy, astrology, and divination, vii. 200; Philo's relation to, 210; expulsion of its professors from Rome, 364. See *Philosophy*
Chaldeans i. 282 sq., 311, 335 sq.; their successive invasions of the southern countries of Asia, iv. 151; rise of their power, 253 sq.; their origin, 254; their migrations southward, 254; settlement in Nineveh and Babylon, 254; their learning, 255; sudden rise of their power in Babylon, 255; their new dominion, founded by Nabopolassar, 255; their supremacy over Judah, 259 sqq.; their siege of Tyre, 270, 277, 300
Chalil, el, i. 335
Chamberlain, the, an officer of Solomon's court, iii. 268
Chananja. See *Ananja*
Channa. See *Annas*
Chaos, idea of in Philo's system, vii. 213 sq.
Character, Aramaic-Semitic or square, v. 93 *note* 2, 132 *note* 2; so-called Assyrian, 107 *note* 2, 488
Chariots introduced by Solomon, 259 sq.; imported from Egypt, iii. 262
Charismata of the early church, vii. 113 sq.
Charrae, in Mesopotamia. See *Haran*
Charran = Kardôn, in the Kurdistan mountains, vii. 404
Chasidees, or Chasîdim, the, or the Pious,

CHA

v. 282, 368; their origin, 300; disappearance of the name, 369; their religious views, 371
Chasphon, or Chasphor, v. 313 *note* 7; captured by Judas Maccabæus, 314
Chebar, river, the Chaboras in Mesopotamia, iv. 264 *note* 7
Chemosh, god of the Moabites, ii. 206; altars to, erected by Solomon, iii. 297
Cherethites, foreign soldiers of David's body-guard, iii. 143
Cherith, the brook, Elijah at, iv. 105; its situation, 105 *note* 1
Cherubs used as decorations in the temple, iii. 239; placed over the ark, 242 sq.; on the bases, 244; conception of, partly suggested the image of the fiery chariot and fiery horses of Elijah, iv. 110 *note* 2
Child and parent, i. 338–40
Chimham, son of Barzillai, accompanies David to Jerusalem, iii. 192; maintained at Solomon's court, 216
China, Judeans in, v. 92 *note* 2, 239
Chittim, the ships of (Dan. xi. 30), v. 297 *note* 1
Chittim, or Chittites, people, i. 110; revolt against Tyre, iv. 162
Chobolo (Kabul), situation of, vii. 540
Chorazin, vi. 253
Christ, portrait of, at Edessa and Rome, vi. 157; his meeting with the Baptist, 172 sq.; his earlier history, 178 sq.; his kindred, 179 sq.; his birth in Bethlehem, 182 sq.; his descent from David, 183 sq.; his baptism, 191 sq.; his fundamental thought, 200 sq.; his general course of labour, 210 sq.; his teaching, 216 sq.; his works of healing, 220 sq.; his higher and exceptional labours, 226 sq.; the motives of his acts, 228 sq.; his relation to the past, 233 sq.; to his own immediate present, 233 sq.; to his future, 238 sq.; the course of his labours until the imprisonment of the Baptist, 242 sq.; the founding of the Messianic kingdom, 272 sq.; the founding of his Community by the choice of the Twelve and their training, 296 sq.; his relation to the heathen, 347 sq.; his final decision with regard to the Hagiocracy, 376 sq.; his betrayal and his outward removal, 405 sq.; the day of the Last Supper and his crucifixion, 414 sq.; his trial, 429 sq.; his death, 437 sq.; his glorification before his death, 353 sq.; and that afterwards, 448 sq., vii. 7 sq.; the name displaces that of Jesus, 9; his resurrection, its significance, 45 sq.; its necessity, 49 sq.; the creation of the Church, 53; the various accounts of, 56 sq.; his mother and brothers,

CHR

127; 'Christ-party' in the Apostolic age, 383 sq.; false imitators of (pseudo-Christs), rise of, 87 sq., viii. 86 sq.: — Simon Magus, vii. 180; Theudas, 414; a Judean of Egypt, 423; one who gave trouble to Festus, 426; later relatives of, viii. 186 sq.; angel of, 236. See *Logos*
Christ's mother and brothers at first not members of his Community, vi. 306; hear he is mad, 314; go to Jerusalem before him, 358; at his death, 442; after his death, vii. 127
Christian faith, in writings of John, viii. 164 sq.; in epistle to the Ephesians, 190 sq.; in pastoral epistles, 197 sq.
Christian hope, its original character and final form, viii. 175 sq.
Christianity the consummation of the Theocracy, vi. 91 sq.; the First Condition of its coming, 94 sq.; the Second Condition, 103 sq.; the Third Condition, 121 sq.; the tendency to fulfil these Conditions in the ancient Community, 129 sq.; Christianity as Christ himself founded it, 200 sq. 453 sq.; characteristics after Christ's death, vii. 1 sq.; certainty of its victory, 12 sq.; difficulties in its way, 18 sq.; its adherence to the Ancient Community at the end of the Apostolic age, 524 sq.; and its severance therefrom, 472 sq.; separation of from Judean community, viii. 21 sq., 98 sq.; relation of to the same immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, 25 sq.; its general condition in the period reviewed in this volume, 100 sq.; the form it assumed, 107 sq.; becomes conscious of its highest destination, 223 sq.; new position during the war of Bar-Kokheba, 285; and after it, 301 sq.
Christians, the name of, vii. 334; other names of, 334; their characteristics and condition, viii. 102 sq.
Christophanies and Theophanies, vii. 73
Chronicler, the, his account of the decree of Cyrus, v. 47
Chronicles, books of, i. 169–96; their sources, 183 sqq.; in the Canon, viii. 335
Chronicles and Chronicler, the, iii. 207; his representation of the possessions of Judah, iv. 3 *note* 3; designation of the northern kingdom, 5 *note* 1; representation of the Egyptian invasion in the reign of Rehoboam, 45 *note* 7; of Abijah's speech, 48 *note* 4; of the speeches of Oded and Hanani, 49 *note* 1; of the removal of the 'heights' by Asa and Jehoshaphat, 49 *note* 2; of Hanani's reproof of Asa, 52 *note* 3; of the chronology of Asa's reign, 52 *note*

5; of Jehoshaphat's arrangements for the administration of justice, &c., 54 *note* 1; of his victory over the Moabites and Ammonites, 55 *note* 4; of his attempt to revive the navigation of the Red Sea, 56 *note* 5; of the population of Judah, 57 *note* 2; of the fall of Athaliah, 135 *note* 5; of the repairs of the temple under Joash, 140 *notes* 1, 3; of the treatment of the Idumeans, 141; of Amaziah's misfortunes, 143 *note* 1; of Uzziah's leprosy, 145; of the relations of Ahaz with the Assyrian king, 171 *note* 3; of the fortifications of Jerusalem executed by Hezekiah, 175 *note* 3; of Hezekiah's religious activity, 189; of the repentance of Manasseh, 217, 218 *note* 3; of the celebration of the Passover, 239 *note* 2; of the fate of the vessels of the temple, 265 *note* 1

Chronicon Samaritanum, ii. 227, 267 sq., 372 *note* 4, 411 *note* 1, viii. 362

Chronology of the early history, i. 204-13; of the Ten Forefathers before and the Ten after the Deluge, 274–77; of the Great Patriarchs, 324 sq., 400 sq., 417; of the residence in Egypt, 392, 397–404, ii. 11 sq., 83 sq.; of the wanderings in the desert, 185–88; of Moses, 211; of Joshua, 254 sq.; of the Judges and till Solomon, 367–373; of Saul's reign, iii. 52; of David's war with Ammon, 160; of the two kingdoms, iv. 20 sqq.; of the second period of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, 117; of the monarchy, 297 sqq.; of the deported Jews in the north-eastern districts, 301; Assyrian, 299; Chaldean, 298 sq.; Tyrian, 299 sq.; Egyptian, 300 sq.; of the exile, v. 72 sqq.; of the descendants of the Ten Tribes in the Crimea, 93 *note* 3; of the high priests, 123 sqq.; method of reckoning in the Persian age, 183; of the Judean coins of Simon, 341; of Christ's life, vi. 149–58; of Apostolic Age, vii. 37 sq., 242; of the war of Bar-Kokheba, viii. 282 sq.

Church, its existence and power generally after Christ's death, vii. 105 sq., 147 sq.; its labours and practices, 112 sq.; its members and constitution, 126 sq.; its spread, 132 sq., 149 sq.; dissolution of the primitive church and formation of a new parent church, 164–73; admittance of the heathen to, 174 sq.; dissolution of parent church, viii. 185 sq.; true idea of Christian church, 190 sq.; government of, 196 sq.; offices of, 205 sq.; prophetic idea of its purpose in 'Shepherd of Hermas,' 238 sq.

Church fellowship, vii. 115 sq.

Chushan-rishathaim, king, ii. 318

Cilicia, expedition of Asarhaddon against, iv. 188 *note* 2

Cimmerians, the, driven westwards by the Scythians, iv. 228

Circumcision i. 324; whether necessary in the Christian church, vii. 353 sq.; Peter dispensed with it, 356; insisted on again by Pharisaic party, 383; though afterwards abandoned, 388; artificial foreskin (Ascension of Moses, cap. 8), viii. 260; prohibited by Trajan, 277; by Hadrian, 285, 292; allowed by Antoninus Pius, 294

City of David, iii. 124, 221, 258, 273

Civic system and the civic union, ii. 342 sqq., 381

Claudius Cæsar, his relation to Herod Agrippa, vii. 257 sq.; his favour towards the Judeans, 259 sq., 413 his dislike of Christians, 261, 364

Clearchus, a pupil of Aristotle, his notice of the Judeans, v. 247

Clemens Flavius, viii. 80 sq., 227 sq.

Clemens Romanus, viii. 227 sq., 235; his epistle to Corinthians, 205–13; second epistle, 246 sq.; new MS., 205, 246; 'Homilies' and 'Recognitions' of, 65, 90, 126; other works ascribed to, 229

Clementine Homilies, vii. 35, 460

Cleobius, founder of a Samaritan sect, viii. 92

Cleopas (Clôpas), vi. 305; derived from Cleopater, *ibid.*; one of the 'Seventy,' vii. 131; viii. 187

Cleopatra, consort of Ptolemy Philomêtor and mother of Ptolemy Lathûrus, v. 357; expels her son from Egypt, 387

Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus the Great, promised in marriage to Ptolemy Epiphanes, v. 284

Cleopatra, of Jerusalem, mother of Philip, v. 449

Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, receives Herod, v. 413; applied to by Alexandra, daughter of Hyrcanus, 424; compels Herod to cede various districts to her, 425; involves Herod in a war with Malich, 425 sq.

'Coasts of the Sea,' the, residence of the Israelites in, v. 4

Cœle-Syria, occupied by Ptolemy Lagi, v. 226

Coins, of Simon, v. 339; of the Asmoneans, 386 *note* 7; of Antigonus, 412 *note* 1; and of Herod, *ibid.*; of the Nabatean Malchus, 412 *note* 5; of Archelaus, 449 *note* 3; Roman-Jewish, vi. 61 sq.; of Cæsarea Philippi, vii. 241; of Mesene, 403; of Damascene Aretas,

327; of Agrippa I., 264 sq., 421 sq.; of the liberated Jerusalem, 529 sq.; of *Judæa Capta*, 612; of Mucianus, 573; welcoming Hadrian into Judea, viii. 282; of the war of Bar-Kokheba, 283, 289; of Neapolis, 290
Comagene. See *Antiochus*
Comedy of Errors, i. 346 sq., 350, 354–56
Commandments, Ten. See *Decalogue*
Commerce, Solomon's efforts to promote, iii. 260 sqq.; foreign, loss of, through the disruption of the kingdom, iv. 18; revived in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes by Ahab, 39; and by Jeroboam, 125; in Judah, by Jehoshaphat, 56; and Uzziah, 143; among the Jews of the dispersion, v. 237 sqq.; protected and promoted by Simon, 336; under the Asmoneans, 363; under Herod, 432
Community of Jahveh, ii. 135–44; its regulations and morals, 151–55; its constitution under Joshua, 258–63
Community, the Christian (church), its foundation by Christ, vi. 293 sq.
Community of goods in Christian church, vii. 115 sq.
Concubines, as mothers of tribes, i. 374 sq.; position of, as royal widows, iii. 115, 182, 212
Condition of the people, the, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, during the first century, iv. 41 sqq.; after the revolution of Jehu, 116; under Jeroboam II., 125 sq.; in Judah during the first period after the disruption, 57 sq.; under Uzziah, 146 sqq.; in the age of Manasseh, 210; effect of the reformation of Josiah, 243 sqq.
Congregation. See *Community of Jahveh*
Coniah, son of Jehoiakim, takes the name of Jehoiachin on his accession, iv. 263. See *Jehoiachin*
Constitutiones Apostolicæ, vii. 36, 460, viii. 13, 201, 229
Coponius, Roman governor, vi. 65 sq.
Coreæ, opposite to Alexandreum, Pompey at, v. 399; Vespasian encamped at, vii. 554
Corinth, Judeans in, v. 240; Paul's first stay at, vii. 377–80: his second visit, 394; Paul's first epistle to, 394; his second epistle, 397; lost epistle to, 393; troubles in church at, viii. 206 sq.
Coronation of Hebrew monarchs, iii. 272
Cos, Judeans in, v. 240
Costoba, late member of Herodean family, vii. 483, 503, 515
Costobar, made governor of Idumea by Herod, v. 421 *note* 2; removes the sons of Bâbâs, 423; laments Mariamne, 428; executed by Herod, 429

Costobar, a kinsman of Agrippa II., v. 421 *note* 2 *ad fin.*
Council, the High. See *Council of Seventy*
Council, the, of Twelve, retained by Ezra, v. 170
Council, the, of Seventy, its first institution, v. 167; and jurisdiction, 168 sqq.; sends elders to Antoninus Epiphanes, 295; defiant behaviour of Herod before, 407. See *Assembly*
Court-pulpit of Solomon, the, iii. 251
Courts, the, of Solomon's temple, iii. 232, 240; of the priests, 232 *note* 3, 233 *note* 1, 243; of the second temple, 232 *note* 4
Covenant, Ark of the. See *Ark of the Covenant*
Covenant, a, made under Hezekiah, iv. 234
Covenant, a new, necessity of, proclaimed by Jeremiah, iv. 291 sq.
Covenant, the, made by Ezra, v. 166
Covenant, the New, promised by the prophets, v. 30, 32
Covenant with God, ii. 143 sq.
Covenants, book of. See *Book of Covenants*
Craft, of David, iii. 62, 102
Crassus, overthrow of, v. 403
Crete, Cerethites and Pelethites, i. 245–49
Crete, Judeans in, v. 240
Crimea, tomb, inscriptions in the, v. 93 *note* 3, 239 *note* 6
Cross and Crucifixion, vi. 437 sq.
Crown, power of the, regulated in Deuteronomy, iv. 224
Crown, the, of the king of Ammon, captured and worn by David, iii. 159; assumed by Solomon on his marriage, 272; use of by Hebrew kings, 6, 272
Crucifixion, commanded by Titus, vii. 596
Ctesiphon, Judeans seek refuge there, vii. 523
Cumanus, Roman governor, vii. 415 sq.
Cush, a Benjamite, his treachery to David, iii. 88
Cushi carries the tidings of Absalom's death to David, iii. 185 *note* 6, 188 sq.; probably one of Joab's ten armour-bearers, 188 *note* 3
Cuthah, a Babylonian city, deportation of settlers rom, into Samaria, iv. 215
Cutheans, name applied by the later Jews to the Samaritans, iv. 216, v. 354, viii. 83
Cyamon, north of Betylûa, ii. 268 *note* 2, v. 476 *note* 3
Cyaxares, son of Phraortes, king of Media, iv. 228; besieges Nineveh, 228; destroys the leaders of the Scythians, 253; his alliance with Nabopolassar, 256

CYA

Cyaxares, king, v. 72 *note* 3, 230 *note* 3
Cyclopean walls, iii. 233
Cyprians, the alliance of Judeans with, v. 206
Cypriote Judeans, vii. 342 sq.
Cypron, fortress of, vii. 510
Cyprus, a city erected by Herod, v. 435
Cyprus, ruled by the Assyrians, iv. 188 *note* 2; Judeans in, v. 240; viii. 274
Cyprus, wife of Agrippa, vii. 237
Cyprus, wife of Antipater, mother of Herod the Great, v. 397; intrigues against Mariamne, 428
Cyrene, Judean troops placed in, v. 237 *note* 5; Judeans in, 240, 437 *note* 1, vii. 616; Judean rising in before Bar-Kokheba's rebellion, viii. 273
Cyrus, king of Persia, his campaign against the Scythians, iv. 229; his conquest of Babylon, 298, 300; attached to the Zarathustrian religion, v. 40; approaches Babylon, 41; the 'anointed' of Jahveh, 45; his decree for the liberation of the Israelites, 47; permission for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, 47, 49; prophetic declarations concerning him, 50; captures Babylon, 51; a divine instrument for the accomplishment of the Messianic expectations, 69; his edict for the return of the exiles, 78; and the restoration of the sacred vessels, *ibid.*; later story of his vow, 126

DAGON, god, ii. 332, 415 sq., 417
Dalmanutha, vi. 348
Damascus, Aramean kingdom of, ii. 302
Damascus, city of, i. 311–13; made tributary to David, iii. 156; occupied by Solomon, 218; commercial roads through, 261; pays tribute to Solomon, 296; regains its independence, after the disruption of the kingdom, iv. 24; alliance with Judah, 24 *note* 5, 25; reconquered by Jeroboam II., 124; after his death attempts to regain its power, 151; new kingdom of, 155; overthrown by Tiglath-Pileser, 160; destroyed by the Assyrians, 161; Ahaz visits Tiglath-Pileser at, 171; subdued by Necho, 251; subjugated by Nabuchodrozzor, 259; takes part with Nabuchodrozzor against Judah, 262; probably the seat of a Persian governor, v. 88 *note* 2; Judeans in, 239; occupied by Jonathan, 332; oppressed by Ptolemæus, son of Mennæus, 391, 394; taken by Aretas, 391; Scaurus at, 398; Pompey at, *ibid.*, 399; reckoned by Pliny a city of Decapolis, 455 *note* 4; as an Arabian city, vii. 327 sq.; prevalence of Judeanism in, 407 sq.; the Judeans

DAV

massacred there, 514. See *Aramæans, Benhadad, Hazael*
Dametha, fortress of, Judeans in the, v. 313; captured by Judas Maccabæus, 314
Damocritus, author of book against Judeans, viii. 65
Dan, in the extreme north of Israel, ii. 293, iii. 162, 194 sq.; calf worship at, iv. 27; subdued by Baasha, 34 *note* 3. See *Paneas*
Dan, the tribe of, i. 181, ii. 289 sq., 338, 348; territory of the tribe divided between the two kingdoms, iv. 2
Daniel, book of, its account of Nabuchodrozzor's madness, v. 2 *note* 2; and of the capture of Babylon, 51; its computation of the period of the exile, 73; its author acquainted with the book of Baruch, 208 *note* 6; its date and composition, 302 sqq.; relation of book of Enoch to, 345, 349, 360; of 3 Macc., 471; prophetic-poetic nature of its narrative, 473 sq.; additions to, 460, 462 *note* 1, 486 sqq.; Dan. i.–vi., 8 *note* 2; xi., 283 sqq.; its Messianic meaning, vi. 110 sq.; allegorised, viii. 53; in the Canon, 335, 341
Daniel, Greek book of, v. 486 sqq.
Daniel, legend of, v. 33, 95; so-called tomb of, 95 *note* 3; a historical personage, 304 *note* 2
Daphne, sanctuary of, near Antioch, v. 295; Antony at, 410; Herod at, 415
Darda, a sage, one of the sons of Mahol, iii. 278
Darius, king of Persia, his campaigns against the Scythians, iv. 229; his place in history, v. 72 *note* 3; succeeds the Pseudo-Smerdis, 108; moderation of his government, 110; story of his restoration of the sacred vessels, 126 sq; his foes, 129 *note* 2
Date-palms near Jericho, viii. 77 sq.
David, his name, iii. 54 *note*; his relation to his age, 54 sqq.; his religious nature, 58; his poetry, 59; his playing, 60, 67; his dancing, 60; his eloquence, 60; his qualifications for ruling, 61; his harshness, 62; his craftiness, 62; his dissimulation, 63; the son of Jesse, 66, 87 *note* 6; born at Bethlehem, 66 anointed by Samuel, according to the later narrator, 66; sent for to soothe Saul with his playing, 68; narrat ves of his combat with Goliath, 69 sqq.; Saul's jealousy of him, 73, 77; marries Michal, 74; is appointed commander of Saul's body-guard, 75; his friendship with Jonathan, 76, 78; is assisted by Michal to escape, 77; takes refuge with Samuel in Ramah, 78; meetings with Jonathan, 79, 81; compelled to flee

from Saul's dominions, 81; at Nob, 82; repairs to Achish, king of Gath, 83; feigns madness, 83; and is expelled, 84; gathers an army round him in Judah, 85; conduct to the elders of Judah, 86; places his parents under the care of the king of Moab, 87, 149; his warriors, 88; relieves Keilah and defeats the Philistines, 89; pursued by Saul in the wilderness of Ziph, 92, 93; visited by Jonathan, 93; retires to the heights of En-gedi, 94; his magnanimity to Saul, 95, 96; descends into the wilderness of Paran, 97; insulted by Nabal, is about to seek revenge, 98; having lost Michal, marries Abigail, 99; and Ahinoam, 99; repairs again to Achish, 100; settles as Philistine vassal at Ziklag, 101; learns the Gittite music, 101; campaigns against the Amalekites, &c., 102; captain of the body-guard of Achish, 103; dismissed by Achish, 104; pursues the Amalekites, 105; hears of the death of Saul and Jonathan, 107; his lament, 107; anointed king of Judah in Hebron, 109; probably paid tribute to the Philistines, 111; war with Ish-bosheth, 113; his matrimonial connexions, 115; receives overtures from Abner, 116; demands the restoration of Michal, 116; lament for Abner, 117; king of Israel, 119; executes the murderers of Ish-bosheth, 119; conquest of Jerusalem, 121 sqq.; fortifies it, 124; erects barracks, an arsenal, his palace, a tabernacle for the ark, 124; presides over the removal of the ark to Jerusalem, 127; his desire to erect a temple to Jahveh, 129 sqq., 226; his designs, 227; his preparations, 228; his reorganisation of the Levites, 133 sq., 247, 318; cultivates the arts, 134; treatment of Saul's descendants, 135 sq.; restores his family estates to Meribosheth, 135; surrenders seven descendants of Saul to the Gibeonites, 136; buries the bodies of Saul and Jonathan at Zelah, 137; his wars, 137 sqq.; military organisation, 139 sqq.; his body-guard, 143; his levies, 144; number of his troops, 145; said in the Koran to have invented chain-armour, 146 *note* 2; war with the Philistines, 148; feats of prowess, 148; conflicts with the Amalekites, 149; conquest of Moab, 149 sq.; Aramean war, 150 sqq.; insulted by Hanum, king of Ammon, 152; marches against Hadadezer, 155; defeats the Arameans, 156; reduces Damascus, 156; returns triumphant to Jerusalem, 158; reduces Rabbah, 159; institutes the census, 160 sq.; rebuked by Gad, 162; three woes in his reign, 162 *note* 6; his temptations, 163 sqq.; his polygamy, 165, 169; contrives the death of Uriah, 166; will not punish Ammon, 171; wears mourning for him, 172; consents to the return of Absalom, 175; reconciled with him, 177; quits Jerusalem on the outbreak of Absalom's rebellion, 179 sq.; is cursed by Shimei, 181; rebukes Abishai, 181; presents Ziba with Meribosheth's estates, 181; takes refuge in Mahanaim, 184; length of his absence from Jerusalem, 184; his lamentation for Absalom, 189; is invited to return by Western Israel, 190; sends Zadok and Abiathar to conciliate Judah, 190; receives the homage of Shimei, 190; of Meribosheth, 191; is escorted over the Jordan by Barzillai, 191; restoration to Jerusalem, 192; his old age, 196; his prophetic spirit, 197 sq.; his priestly dignity, 133, 200; general results of his career, 199 sqq.; has Solomon proclaimed king before his death, 211; death and burial, 203; treasures buried in his tomb, 228 *note* 1; 'sepulchres of,' 254 *note* 5; organisation of the government afterwards attributed to him, 266; subsequent collection of his songs, 282; tomb of, opened by John Hyrcanus, v. 344; Herod erects a monument over, 435; Vespasian's search for descendants of, viii. 79; Domitian's search for, 188 sq.; Davidic lyrics, 329

David, a second expected, vi. 105 sq.

David, city of, iii. 124, 221, 258, 273

David, house of, its position in the kingdom of Judah, iv. 11 sq.; its restoration an element in the Messianic hope, 60 sq.; danger of its overthrow by the machinations of the kings of Samaria and Damascus, 170; prophetic anticipations of its future greatness, 203 sq.; faith in its perpetuity, 295

David, the expected Messiah called, by Hosea, iv. 203 *note* 2

Davidic descendants in the postexilian Israel, vi. 109 sq., 183 sq.

Davidic kingdom, the, iii. 307 sqq.

Davidic lyrics, viii. 329

'Day of Jahveh,' threatened by the prophets, iv. 127; in extant prophetic writings first announced by Joel, 127 *note* 3

Deacons, the first seven, vii. 144, viii. 210 sq.

Dead Sea, the, boundary of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 4 *note* 1

Debarija, village of, vii. 538

De Bello Judaico, the Christian reproduction of, v. 343 *note* 1

Deberath (Deburieh), place i. 376 *note* 2

DEB

Debir, town, ii. 285
Deborah, her position in Israel, iv. 134 *note* 3
Deborah, Rebekah's nurse, i. 293 sq., ii. 375 *note* 2
Deborah's (Tabor's) Terebinth, iii. 21 *note* 4, iv. 31 *note* 4.
Deborah, the judge, ii. 374–79; her Song, 319, 350 sq., 354 sq.
Decalogue, i. 48, 73, ii. 18 sq., 20, 158–64; similar decads of commandments, 162-68; neglect of the, iv. 240
Decapolis, the, v. 330, 455, vi. 317, 347; parties in, under Josephus, vii. 533; volunteers from, against Vespasian, 548
Decapolitana, or Cæsarea Philippi, vi. 72
'Decree' of the parent church at Jerusalem, vii. 355 sq.
Dedication of the temple, the, under Solomon, iii. 215 sqq.; feast of the, established by Judas Maccabæus, v. 312; neglected by the Hellenists, 465, 467
Dehavites, the, an eastern tribe deported to Samaria, iv. 216 *note* 1
Delilah, ii. 407 *note* 1
Delos, Judeans in, v. 240
Demænetus, advises Ptolemais to open its gates to Ptolemy Lathûrus, v. 387
Demetrius, a freedman of Pompey, receives Gadara, v. 400
Demetrius, author treating of Judea, viii. 62
Demetrius II. Nicator, son of Demetrius Sôtêr, lands on the Cilician coast, v. 329; confirms Jonathan in his position, 330; fails to keep his promises, 331; recognises Simon as high-priest, 334; a second time on the throne of Syria, 345; his wars in the book of Judith, 475 sq.; chronology, 475 *note* 7
Demetrius Phalèreus, the adviser of Ptolemy Philadelphus, v. 250 sq.
Demetrius Poliorcètes, defeated by Ptolemy Lagi, v. 226; destroys Samaria, 227
Demetrius Sôtêr, son of Seleucus Philopator, sent as a hostage to Rome, v. 293; alluded to in Dan. vii. 24, 304 *note* 1; claims the Syrian throne on the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, 316; lands at Tripolis, 319; sends Bacchides to Jerusalem, 320; his proposals to Jonathan, 327; further concessions, 328; is defeated, and perishes, *ibid.*
Demoniacas, cured by Paul, vii. 391
Demons, belief in possession by, vi. 221 sq.; Christ's treatment of, 222 sq., 314 317 sq.
Demoteles, Spartah ambassador, v. 245
Deportation, of Israelites from the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, by Tiglath-Pileser, in the reign of Pekah, iv. 160 sq., 166; by Shalmaneser, on the fall of

DIS

Samaria, 164, 165; from Judah, by Nabuchodrozzor, first, in the reign of Jehoiachin, 264; second, in the reign of Zedekiah, 273; third, on the destruction of Jerusalem, 275; fourth, five years after, 277
Deputies, or elders, their position under the monarchy, iii. 11, 109, 119, 216, 310 sq.; their share in legislation in the two kingdoms, iv. 115
Derbe, Paul at, vii. 348; return to, 350
Destiny-rock, iii. 93
Deuteronomist authors, their labours on Solomon's life, iii. 207
Deut. xviii. 14–20, vol. iv. 226 *note* 3; xxxii., 9 *note* 1, 194 *note* 5, 218 *note* 1, 283 note 2; xxxiv. 10-12, 226 *note* 3
Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist, i. 117–32; divisions of the book, 120 sqq.; Deuteronomic treatment of the history of the kings, 156 sqq., ii. 30 sq., 234
Deuteronomy, its author belonged to the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 9 *note* 1; history and nature of his work, 221 sqq.; speaks in the name of Moses, 222; spiritualises the old law, 222 sq.; mild spirit of the book, 223; regulation of the powers of the crown and of the prophets, 224; laws of war, 224; treatment of the Gérim, 224; and of the Levites, 225; marriage with a husband's brother, 225; worship of God limited to one place, 225; the Messianic hope in, 226, vi. 106; discovery of it in the temple, iv. 234; written in Egypt, 235; only recommended one or two nations to Israel's equity, 251; its style, 279; want of arrangement in, 286; made sacred, viii. 319
Diaspora, the, vi. 81–85; the Judean and Christian, vii. 305; 'Twelve Tribes' in, 360
Didymus. See *Thomas*
Dinah, Jacob's daughter, i. 378 sq.
Dinaites, the, an eastern tribe deported to Samaria, iv. 216 *note* 1
Dio-Cæsarea, viii. 82. See *Sepphoris*
Dio Cassius on Jewish war, vii. 494
Diogenes, a friend of Alexander Jannæus, executed by the Pharisees, v. 393
Diognetus, epistle to, viii. 173 sq
Dion, east of the Jordan, v. 236; captured by Alexander Jannæus, 391; victory of Herod at, 426
Diospolis, viii. 82
Diotrephes, viii. 159
Disciples, Christ's first, vi. 244 sq.
Discipline in the Church, vii. 139 sq.
Disease, cure of, by Christ, vi. 222–26
Dispersion (Diaspora), the, v. 4; friendly relations between Israel and the heathen, 33; on the Black Sea, 93 *note*

3, 239 *note* 6; in the Greek age, 237 sqq.; in the days of Herod, 436 sqq.
Disruption of the kingdom, the, iii. 308 sqq.; its immediate consequences, iv. 1 sqq.; date of, 300
Docetæ, viii. 135
Dodavah, father of Eliezer, iv. 53
Dodecarchy, the, in Egypt, iv. 163 *note* 2, 188 *note* 5, 215
Doeg, the Edomite, at Nob, iii. 84; massacres the priests of Nob, 90
Dôk, a fortress near Jericho, v. 342
Domitian, viii. 79 sq.; search of, for relatives of the Lord, 188 sq.; persecution under, 227 sq.
Dora, on the coast, iii. 263; battle between Antiochus and Tryphon near, v. 338; besieged by Alexander Jannæus, 387; maritime town in Southern Galilee, vii. 262
Doris, mother of Herod's son, Antipater, v. 439
Dositheus, an Egyptian Judean, captain under Ptolemy Philomêtor, v. 357
Dositheus, a Samaritan philosopher, v. 279; founder of a sect in Samaria, viii. 94 sq.
Dothan, the residence of Elisha, iv. 121; its situation, 121 *note* 9, v. 476 *note* 3
Dragon-well, or Serpent's-pool, position of the, iii. 254 *note* 2, 256 *note* 1
Drama in Israel, the, iii. 282, iv. 42, 199
Dreams, sacred, i. 329 sq.; divination by means of, iii. 51; of Josephus, vii. 547
Drusias, a city built by Herod, v. 431 *note* 6
Drusilla, daughter of Agrippa I., wife of Felix, vii. 421 sq.

Eagles, the Roman, vi. 65; in fourth book of Ezra, viii. 54; in second book of Baruch, 59
Earthquake, the, in the reign of Uzziah, iv. 131 *note* 1
Ebal, Mount, in Samaria, ii. 279; reference to in Deuteronomy, v. 218; changed into Gerîzîm in the Samaritan Pentateuch, 219
Ebion and Ebionites, viii. 152
Ecclesiastes, book of, iii. 252; in the Canon, viii. 334, 339. See *Koheleth*
Ecclesiasticus. See *Wisdom of Jesus*
Ecdippa, on the coast, v. 412
Eden, land of, i. 282
'Eden,' 'sons of,' an Aramean tribe, iv. 150 *note* 6
Edessa, portrait of Christ at, vi. 157
Edom and the Edomites, their history, i. 75, 109 sqq., 344, 348 sq., 353, 368 sq., 375; their history, ii. 200 sq.
Edom, Saul's wars with, iii. 43; subjugation of by Joab, 157; revolt and conquest of, 217 sq.; importance of its possession for the navigation of the Red Sea, 263; belonged to Judah after the disruption of the kingdom, iv. 4; attempts to regain its independence with Egyptian aid, 45; and partially succeeds in the reign of Rehoboam, 47; its subjugation effected by Jehoshaphat, 56; its aid claimed against Moab, 88; possible origin of its name, 88 *note* 4; revolts from Judah in the reign of Jehoram, 94; incursions of Edomites in the reign of Joash, 138; conquered by Amaziah, 141; regains its power, 142; subjugated by Uzziah, 131 *note* 1, 143; its wisdom, 192; revolts from Judah under Manasseh, 214; its treatment, 219; Josiah attempts its subjection, 241 sq.; sends ambassadors to Zedekiah for aid against the Chaldeans, 268; finally takes part with the Chaldeans against Judah, 271; prophetic indignation against, v. 15; conquered by Gashmu, 153. See *Idumæa*
Edom, or Esau, name of Rome, viii. 272 sq.
Edrei, place, ii. 207, 295
Egypt, Israel's residence in, i. 385–422, ii. 3–15, 34–94; exodus from, 67–76, 97–101, 185–201; its magic, iii. 50; relations of Israel with, under David, 142; under Solomon, 220 sq.; Hadad takes refuge in, 217; commercial road from, 261; its aid called in by Jeroboam I. against Jerusalem, iv. 25; its influence on religion in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, 26; alliance of Jeroboam with, its danger to Judah, 44; Egyptians invade Judah, 46; inclination of the popular party in Israel to alliance with, 156; alliance of Hoshea with, 163 sq., 176; flight of Israelites to, 166; desire for alliance with, at Jerusalem, 176, 179; invaded by Sennacherib, 179; conquered by Asarhaddon, 215; alliance of Judah with, till the beginning of Josiah's reign, 218, 219; Scythians penetrate to, 229, 230; its condition under the twenty-ninth dynasty, 240 sq.; its supremacy over Judah, 251 sqq.; Egyptians in possession of Gaza, advance against the Chaldeans, 261; driven out of Asia after Jehoiachin's accession, 264; send aid to Judah against the Chaldeans, 273; are driven back, 273; Jeremiah and others settle in, 276; its inability to assist Israel during the Captivity, v. 2 sq.; prediction of the great Unnamed in reference to, 45; campaigns of Cambyses against, 106,

116; Judeans in, at the time of Philo, 240; relations of Judeans in Palestine with, 271; troops in Palestine, 258 See *Hophra, Necho, Shishak*
Egyptian cavalry, ii. 74 sq.
Egyptian chronology, iv. 300 sq.
Egyptian-Hebrew words, ii. 3 sq.
Egyptian Judeans, v. 354 sqq., 465 sqq., 469, 480; in the army, 368; troops at Pelusium, 403 sq.
Egyptian manners and civilisation, influence of, on Israel, iii. 225, 260, 266, 268, 270, 271, 273
Egyptian plagues, ii. 61–65
Egyptian princess, married to Solomon, iii. 220 sq., 272; her residence, 221, 249 *note* 2, 250
Egyptian religion, its contrast to that of Israel, ii. 8 sq., 39 sq., 55, 58
Egyptian vessels and raiment carried off at the exodus, ii. 65–67
Egypto-Persian wars under Xerxes and Artaxerxes, v. 148 *note* 3
Ehud, judge, ii. 373 sq.
Ekron, a Philistine city, iii. 72; regains its independence in the reign of Rehoboam, iv. 47; oracle of Baal-zebub at, 78; bestowed on Jonathan, v. 329
Elah, father of Hoshea, iv. 161
Elah, son of Baasha, king of the Ten Tribes, iv. 35; the last of his house, 8 *note* 1; assassinated in Tirzah by Zimri, 35
Elam, included in the Assyrian empire, iv. 150; Israelites deported to, under Tiglath-Pileser, 166; the frontier land of the Persians, v. 40 *note* 1
Elamites, in Nabuchodrozzor's army, iv. 262
Elath, or Elah, on the Red Sea, ii. 200; rebuilt by Uzziah, iv. 143; conquered by Rezin, 159
Elath, gulf of, in the Red Sea, iii. 217
Elath, harbour of, iii. 263
el-Chalil, i. 335
Eldad and Medad, ii. 29, 311 *note* 3
Elders of the people after Joshua, ii. 311–14, 341–44
Elders, or deputies, their position under the monarchy, iii. 11, 109, 119, 216, 310 sq.
Elders, the, in the New Jerusalem, v. 86, 87
Elders (presbyters), the, in the early church, vii. 146; as sharing the duties of the Twelve, *166 sq.* See *Presbyters*
Eleasah, north of Jerusalem, Judas Maccabæus at, v. 323
Eleazar, a Pharisee, insults John Hyrcanus, v. 382 sq.
Eleazar, brother of Simon I., high-priest, v. 270; said to have sent the seventy-two translators to Alexandria, 251; and to have gone there himself, 253

Eleazar, captain of temple-guard and rebel, vii. 482, 503, 505, 529
Eleazar of Modin, his prayers in Bar-Kokheba's war, viii. 291
Eleazar, son of Aaron, ii. 262, 267, 313; his high-priestly family, 409 sq.
Eleazar, son of Dodo, colonel in David's army, iii. 141
Eleazar, son of Simon, priest and leader, vii. 529, 574
Eleazar, youngest brother of Judas Maccabæus, killed near Beth-Zachariah, v. 318
Election, popular, of officers of the Church, viii. 204 sq.
Elegies, composed by Jeremiah on Josiah, iv. 243
Eleutheropolis, its position, iii. 89 *note* 4
Eleutherus, the river, the extreme boundary of Palestine in the north-west, v. 332
Elhanan, son of Jair, slays Goliath of Gath, iii. 70, 148
Eli, fate of the house of, iii. 213
Eli, judge, ii. 408–11; his sons, 412 sq.
Eliahu, full form of the name Elijah, iv. 64 *note* 1
Eliakim, son of Josiah, king of Judah, assumes the name of Jehoiakim on his accession, iv. 252
Eliashib, high-priest in the time of Nehemiah, v. 153; assigned a building in the temple to Tobiah, 159; obliged to restore it, 160; rebuked by Nehemiah, 173, 205; his grandsons John and Jesus, 205
'Eliashib's house,' iii. 248 *note* 11
Elib, or Bilib, governor of Babylon, iv. 214 *note* 5
Eliezer, of Damascus, i. 294
Elijah, a prophet, iv. 63 sqq.; came from Tishbeh and belonged to the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, 64; resists the persecution of Jezebel, 66; his habits of retirement, 68; his dress, 68; recalled by Ahab after the drought, 69; his opposition to the priests of Baal, 70; denounces Ahab and Jezebel for the murder of Naboth, 75; consulted by Ahaziah, 78; various forms of his work, 79; calls Elisha, 81; higher conception of, 101 sqq.; the originator of the great revolution, 102; calamities following his labours, 103; relation of the Elijah-narrative to the Elisha-cycle, 103 *note* 2; announces the drought to Ahab, 104; at the brook Cherith, 105; and at Sarepta, 105; contest with the prophets of Baal on Carmel, 106; flees to Beersheba, 107; and thence to Sinai, 107 sq.; his commissions in reference to Hazael and Jehu, 109; his ascension, 109 sqq.; later narratives of, 111 sq.;

destroys the messengers of Ahaziah, 112; his letter to Jehoram of Judah, 112; ranked with Enoch and Moses, 113; believed to have appeared as Phinehas, 113; the pattern of eternal youth, 113; apocryphal writings under his name, 113 *note* 3; his pretended grave, 113 *note* 6; his influence not confined to the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, 128; expected return of, vi. 106, 128
Elim, place, ii. 99
Elisha, a prophet, son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah, iv. 80 sqq.; his call by Elijah, 81; length of his career, 81, 87; called 'father,' and 'the chariot of Israel and its horsemen,' 82; refused Benhadad's present, 83 *note* 3; narratives of his miracles, 85 sqq.; improves the water of Jericho, 85; curses the children, 85; increases the widow's oil, 85; restores the Shunammite's son to life, 85; renders the unwholesome food of the sons of the prophets innocuous, 85; miracle of the loaves, 86; saves an axe out of the Jordan, 86; cures Naaman, 86; frustrates the incursions of the Arameans, 86, 121 sq.; prevents the conquest of Samaria by Benhadad, 87; advises the Shunammite to leave the country, 87; predicts to Hazael his future career, 87, 93; accompanies the expedition of Jehoram against Moab, 88; foretells the deliverance of Samaria, 90; has Jehu anointed, 96 sq.; his relations with him, 102; follows Elijah, 110; and witnesses his ascension, 111; relations with the kings of the house of Jehu, 120; inflicts blindness on the soldiers sent to capture him, 122; his death, 123; his influence not confined to the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, 128; his inferiority to Elijah, 81, 128
Elkesaites, viii. 122 sq.
Elkosh, north of Nineveh, residence of Nahum at, iv. 165, 228
Elohim, use of the name, in place of Jahveh, v. 198
Elon, judge, ii. 366
el-Ram, probably the ancient Ramah, iv. 34 *note* 2
Elthem, an Arabian general, opposed to Herod, v. 426
Elulæus, king of Tyre, i. 110; conquers the Chittites, iv. 162
Elymas, Bar-Jesu, Judean magician, vii. 342 *sq.*
Emmaus, Syrian forces at, v. 310; fortified by Bacchides, 325 *note* 2; burned by Varus, 454; destroyed by earthquake, viii. 282
Emmaus, 'the warm baths,' south of Tiberias, vii. 550
Emmaus, west of Jerusalem, vii. 553
Emin, people, i. 228
Encampments of the Israelites in the Desert, ii. 67 sqq., 97–101, 191 sqq.
Endor, witch of, iii. 51
Enemessar, corruption of Shalmaneser, iv. 162 *note* 1
En-gedi, on the shore of the Dead Sea, iii. 94; David at, 96, 97; Moabites, &c. at, iv. 55
Enoch, book of, representation of Zerubbabel, Joshua, and Nehemiah in, v. 162; date and purport of, 345 sqq.; its threats against the free-minded, 350; promises a new temple, 432; its diffuseness, 462 *note* 1; its philosophy of history, 489; Messianic hope in, vi. 111 sq.
Enoch, Forefather, i. 265 sq., 281
Enoch, translation of, partly suggested the idea of the ascension of Elijah, iv. 110 *note* 2; Elijah subsequently ranked with, 113
Entychitæ, followers of Cleobius, viii. 92
Epaphroditus, patron of Josephus, viii. 70
Ephes-dammim, a mountain in western Judah, iii. 68
Ephesians, epistle to the, viii. 190 sq.
Ephesus, Judeans in, v. 239; decree in favour of the Judeans, 364; Paul's stay in, vii. 388 sq.; his last words to elders of church at, 399 sq.; scene of the Apostle John's labours, viii. 155 sq.
Ephraim and Ephrath, country, i. 382 sq., ii. 276 sq.
Ephraim, city of, iii. 172 *note* 1
Ephraim, forest of, iii. 185 *note* 6
Ephraim, or Aphærema, a Samaritan district attached to Judah, v. 228
Ephraim, tribe of, its claims and dignity, ii. 277–81, 321 sq.; iii. 48, 304; land of, Ish-bosheth king over, 112
Ephraim, unknown place in N.E. Judea, vi. 375, vii. 573
Ephraim, used by the prophets as a contemptuous designation of the northern kingdom, iv. 5
Ephron, a city of Israel, taken by Abijah, iv. 48
Ephron, east of the Jordan, reduced by Judas Maccabæus, v. 315
Ephron, or Ephraim, v. 228
Epic poetry, i. 37
Epicrates, a general of Ptolemy Lathûrus, v. 353
Epicureans, among the Judeans, v. 257
Epistles Pastoral, viii. 198 sq.
Epistles, Paul the originator of this form of Christian literature, vii. 321 sq.
Erech, a city in Ephraim, iii. 181
Esarhaddon, son of Sennacherib. See *Asarhaddon*

ESA

Esau, son of Isaac, i. 234, 300, 344 sq.
Esdraelon, plain of, v. 476 *note* 3
Esdras, third [first] book of, v. 127, 480; fourth [second] book of, representation of Ezra in, 163
Eshtemoa, a city in the south of Judah, iii. 86 *note* 3
Essenes, or Essees, their origin, v. 370; meaning of the name, 370 *note* 2; their characteristics, 371 sqq.; their retirement from the world, 372; their communities, 373 sqq.; treatment by Herod, 438; their attitude towards Messianic hope, vi. 122, 130; in Christian church, vii. 382 sq.; Essenes, allies of Zealots, 500; John, the Essene, 530; viii. 144; Canon of, 339; conversion of to Christianity, 145; amalgamation of with disciples of the Baptist, 120 sq.
Essenes, gate of, in Jerusalem, vii. 581
Estates of the realm. See *Deputies*
Esther, book of, i. 60, 197 sq.; its representation of the relation between Israel and the heathen, v. 33, 191, 212 *note* 5; date and purport of, 230 sqq.; relation of 3 Macc. to, 471; in the Canon, viii. 335, 337, 339, 363
Esther, history of, relates to the general fate of the Judeans among the heathen, v. 117
Etam, near Bethlehem, Solomon's parks at, iii. 256
Etham, place, ii. 68 *note* 2
Ethan, a musician, iii. 248; and a sage, 278; great grandson of Samuel, 278 *note* 2
Ethbaal, king of Tyre, father of Jezebel, iv. 39
Ethiopia, Judeans in, v. 240
Ethiopian Christians, their legends of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, iii. 284 *note* 2, 285 *note* 2, 319
Ethiopian Judeans, viii. 15, 274
Ethiopians, in the Egyptian army of invasion of Judah, in the reign of Rehoboam, iv. 46, 51 *note* 4; assist Judah against Sennacherib, 179 sq. See *Zerah* and *Tirhakah*
Ethnarch, Judean, at Damascus, vii. 328
Euaratus of Cos, at the court of Herod, v. 443 *note* 3
Eubœa, Judeans in, v. 240
Eunuchs, introduction of, iii. 271
Euphrates, the, contest of David with the king of Zobah on its banks, iii. 152; boundary of the kingdom of Zobah, 154; of Solomon's empire, 221
Eupolemus, the historian, i. 50, viii. 63
Europe, flight of the Israelites to, iv. 166
Eurycles, a Lacedæmonian at the court of Herod, v. 443

EZE

Eusebius, his Ecclesiastical History, value and defects of, vii. 36; viii. 12; on the Canon of the New Testament, 348
Evangelist, Jesus the first, vi. 216
Evangelists, the, in the early church, vii. 113, 146
Evil-Merodach, succeeds Nabuchodrozzor, v. 18; and releases Jehoiachin, *ibid.*; king of Babylon, 52 *notes* 1, 3
Excommunication, the lesser, of Jesus, vi. 292 sq., 321; of his followers, 345; in the Christian church, vii. 139; amongst the Rabbis, viii. 35
Exegesis, rules of amongst the Rabbis, viii. 42; of Akiba, 263 sq.
Exile, the, period of its commencement, v. 4; its duration, 72 sqq.; of the Ten Tribes, 93 *note* 3
Exiles, the, from Israel, under Tiglath-Pileser, iv. 160; under Shalmaneser, 164; from Judah, in the reign of Jehoiachin, 264; their hopes of deliverance, 267; in the reign of Zedekiah, 273, 275 sq.; on their return occupy Jerusalem, &c., v. 80; hope of their return, viii. 177
Exodus from Egypt, ii. 57, 67-94
Ezekiel, a prophet of Judah, his survey of foreign affairs, iv. 196 *note* 1; successive editions of his prophetic writings, 196 *note* 3; predicts new incursions of Northmen, 229; designates the house of Israel 'House of Disobedience,' 245; belonged to the priesthood, 249, 264; distinguishes the Chaldeans from the Babylonians, 256 sq.; carried away captive, 264 *note* 7; commenced his ministry in exile, 268 sq.; contends against false hopes of the success of Zedekiah's rebellion, 269; discerns Babylonian religions creeping in among the exiles, 269 sq.; his picturesque style, 279, 283; oracles on foreign nations, 280; his erudition, 282; orthography of his name, v. 11 *note* 1; a prophet of the Captivity, 5, 12 sqq.; last lines of his book, 14; his supposed sepulchre, *ibid.*; looks for the restoration of the national and priestly ordinances, 32; his charges against Israel, 53; and delineation of the new kingdom, 60; view of the duration of the Captivity, 73; fondness for imagery, 185, 188
Ezekiel, book of, iii. 22–vii., vol. iv. 268 *note* 4; xii. 1–20, 269 *note* 3; xii.–xx., 269 *note* 2; xiv. 12–xv., 269 *note* 3; xvii., *ibid.*, 283 *note* 3; xix., *ibid.*; xxi., 271 *note* 1; xxv., 271 *note* 2; xxxi., xxxii., 283 *note* 3; xxxv., 271 *note* 2; xxxviii., xxxix., 229 *note* 4, vol. v. 14 *note* 4; iv., 90 *note* 1, 93

EZE

note 2; xxviii. 2–10, 16 *note* 4; xxxvii. 15–28, 90 *note* 1, 93 *note* 2; xl.–xlviii., 32 *note* 2

Ezekiel, author of a Greek drama on the 'March out of Egypt,' v. 260

Ezekiel, a Jew of Alexandria, his Ἐξαγωγή, ii. 88

Ezion Geber, harbour of, on the Red Sea, iii. 263; Jehoshaphat's projected voyages from, iv. 56

Ezra, his memoirs, i. 192; beginning of his history, v. 117; his family, 129; bears the surname 'the priest,' 130; also called the 'scribe,' *ibid.*; distinguished for his learning, 132; re-establishes the law of Moses, 133 sqq.; preparations for his journey to Jerusalem, 136; powers conferred upon him, *ibid.*; rendezvous on the Ahava, 137; induces a number of Levites to join him, 138; reaches Jerusalem, *ibid.*; chief judge in Jerusalem, 139 sqq.; horror at the discovery of the mixed marriages, 139, 141; proposes that all foreign wives and children should be dismissed, 142; subsequent labours, 143 sqq.; trains up a band of scribes and judges, 144; their services to the people, 145; organises public worship, 145 sqq.; leads one of the processions at the consecration of the walls, 158; later representations of, 161–64; put on the same level with Moses, 164; his eternal youth, *ibid.*; his grave, *ibid.*; his covenant, 166; at the head of the Great Assembly, 169; his action with regard to the Pentateuch and the Canon of the Old Testament, viii. 321, 330; books of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Canon, 333, 335; fourth book of, 47; addition to, found in Latin translation, 56

Ezra, book of, purity of its language, v. 182; memoirs of, 190; ii. 82 *note* 3, 83 *note* 1, 86 *notes* 2, 5, 100 *note* 6; iii. 3, 101 *note* 4; iv. 7-23, 121 *note* 1; v. 5–vi. 13, 111 *note* 4; vii.–x. 141 *note* 2; vii. 12–26, 136 *note* 1; viii. 1–14, 137 *note* 5; ix. 4, 141 *note* 1; x. 18–44, 143 *note* 1; third book of, v. 127, 480; fourth book of [2 Esdras], Messianic ideas in, vi. 115; idea of a Messiah, son of Joseph, not found in, 121. See *Esdras*

Ezra and Nehemiah, books of, i. 169, 188–95

Ezrah, a Levite, ancestor of Ethan and Heman, iii. 278 *note* 2

FABIUS, a Roman general, assists Antigonus, v. 408

Fadus, Roman governor, vii. 412 sq.

FOR

Faith, Christian, vii. 82 sq.; in Paul's case, 290 sq; in epistle of James, 453 sq.

Families, family histories, i. 23 sq., 179–81, 195, 210 sq., 362 sqq., 381 sqq.

Famines in the time of Claudius, vii. 335

Fast days, origin of, v. 22

Fasting, Christ's disinclination towards, vi. 288 sq; Pharisees' overestimate of its virtues, 335

'Father,' use of the title, applied to the prophets, iv. 82, 129

Feasts, the annual, celebrated in Ezra's time, v. 144, 166; of Pûrîm, 231 sqq., 358; connected with Pûrîm, 321, 469; of the purification of the temple under Judas Maccabæus, 311; calendar of, 381, 468; glorified by the author of 2 Macc., 465; festival-book, 470, 473; at Jerusalem, known to have been attended by Jesus: (1) a Passover in his youth, vi. 187 sq.; (2) a Passover at beginning of his ministry, 254 sq.; (3) probably the Feast of Tabernacles of the next year, 281 sq.; (4) the Feast of Tabernacles the next year, 357 sq.; (5) the Feast of Dedication the same year, 360, 365 sq.; (6) the Passover of the next year, 384 sq.; of Samaritans, viii. 93 sq.; Trajan's Day, 280. See *Xylophory*

Feet, Apostles', washed by Christ, vi. 414 sq.; not admitting of repetition subsequently, 417

Fehme, against Paul's life, vii. 436; against Roman government, 425 sq.; its members at Massada, 502, 504, 567 sq.

Felix, Roman governor, vii. 416 sq., 437 sq.

Festus, Porcius, Roman governor, vii. 424 sq.

Fig-tree, the, disappointing Christ's hopes of fruit, vi. 400 sq.; parable of barren, 401

Finances of the kingdom under Solomon, iii. 293 sqq.

Fire, sacred, at the dedication of the temple, iii. 247; at the contest on Carmel, iv. 106

Flaccus, Avilius, Egyptian governor, vii. 251

Flaccus, Syrian governor, vii. 238

Florus, Gessius, vii. 483

Food, laws concerning, in Christian church, vii. 187 sq., 357 sq., 383 sq., 432, 466, 475; amongst Judeans, 506, 536

Footstool, the sacred [A.V. 'mercy-seat'], iii. 242 sq.

Forced labour in Egypt, ii. 13–15, 82

Forecourts of the temple. See *Courts*
Forefathers, the first and the second groups of ten, i. 264 sqq.
Forgiveness of sins, Christ's authority, as to, vi. 286 sq., 290 sq.
Fortification of Jerusalem by David, iii. 124 sq.; by Solomon, 258; constructed by Uzziah, iv. 143 sq.; by Jotham, 166; by Hezekiah, 175; restored by Manasseh, 218
Fortresses, circle of, erected by Solomon, iii. 259; erected in Judah, by Rehoboam, iv. 45
Forty years in the Desert, ii. 185, 188
Foundation gate of the temple, the, iv. 135
Free cities, ii. 342–44
Freeholders, their origin and position, iii. 18, 42, 293 *note* 1
'Friend,' the king's, a minister of state, iii. 266
Friendship of David and Jonathan, iii. 76
Fulvia, wife of Saturninus, a convert to Judaism, vi. 83
Fureidîs, modern Arabic name of a hill near Bethlehem, iii. 256

Gaal, son of Jobel, ii. 343, 358
Gabara (Gabaroth), in centre of Galilee, vii. 538, 541 *note*
Gabath, or Gabatha, a fortress in the north, occupied by Aristobulus, v. 394; cavalry soldiers located there by Herod, 430; vii. 507
Gabiniopolis, a name assumed by Samaria, v. 401
Gabinius, an officer of Pompey, v. 399; campaign against Alexander, 402; and against Egypt, 403
Gad, a prophet, joins David in the wilderness, iii. 89; rebukes him for the census, 162; harmonious action with David, 300
Gad, land of, iii. 162
Gad, tribe, ii. 296 sqq., 324 sq.: eleven heroes of, join David in the wilderness, iii. 87
Gadara, an ancient reading for *Gergasa*, vi. 317
Gadara, near the lake of Galilee, v. 236; besieged by Alexander Jannæus, 388; given by Pompey to Demetrius, 400; made the centre of a district, 403; ceded to Cleopatra, 425 *note* 2; complaints of the citizens against Herod, 436; made a free city, 455, vii. 507
Gadi, father of Menahem, iv. 154
Gadias-Antipater, execution of, by Herod, v. 429 *note* 1
Galatians, as Christians, vii. 306 sq., 387 sq.
Galgala, the Syrians march upon, v. 323; its position, 323 *note* 1
Galilee and Galileans, most prepared for the Gospel, vi. 272 sq.
Galilee, name, ii. 331; subject to the Chaldeans after the destruction of Jerusalem, v. 89; still inhabited by many Israelites, *ibid.*; its name, 99; powerful heathen element in, *ibid.*; its connection with Judah, 98, 228; placed under the Roman governor of Syria, 401; restored to Judea by Cæsar, 406; cleared of robbers by Herod, 407; subdued by Herod, 413 sq., 415; left to Herod Antipas, 449
Galileans, earliest Christians, vii. 129 sq., 132
Gallians, in Babylon, v. 285; mercenaries of Herod, 420, 424 *note* 5
Gallio, Proconsul, Paul before, vii. 379 sq.
Gallus, Ælius, campaign of, v. 436
Galuth, the Israelitish exiles of the Parthian Empire, vi. 84
Gamala, on the east of lake of Galilee, reduced by Alexander Jannæus, v. 391, vii. 509, 537, 541; siege of, 550 sq.
Gamaliel I. (Rabbi), his sayings follow Shammai's in *Pirqæ Aboth*, vi. 14, vii. 539; account of, in Talmud, vii. 193 sq.
Gamaliel (Rabbi) the younger, viii. 34; slowness to admit a proselyte of Ammon, 43
Gareb, older name for the hill Golgotha, vi. 439
Garsis (perhaps Taris), vii. 543, 597
Gashmu, an Arabian prince, founder of the Nabatean power, v. 153
Gates of Jerusalem, iii. 254 *note* 5; the middle gate, iv. 274
Gates of the temple, iii. 241; the runners' gate, iv. 135; the upper gate, built by Jotham, 166; the beautiful gate, also called Nicanor's, v. 322 *note* 1
Gath, a city in the south of Judah, iii. 86 *note* 3
Gath, a Philistine city, ii. 417, iii. 70, 72; David's flight to, 84; his settlement at, 101; gigantic warriors from, 148; had a king of its own under Solomon, 148 *note* 9; Shimei pursues his slaves to, 215; fortified by Rehoboam, iv. 47; conquered by Uzziah, 131 *note* 1, 143; conquered by Joash, 137; liberated by Hazael, 137 sq.
Gath, Little. See *Gittôn*
Gath-hepher, in Galilee, native city of Jonah, iv. 123
Gaulon (Gôlân), district, ii. 295, vii. 507
Gaulon, near the lake of Galilee, reduced by Alexander Jannæus, vi. 391

Gaulonitis, assigned to Philip, v. 455 *note* 6
Gaza, on the Egyptian frontier, iii. 221, 261; a Philistine city, resists Uzziah, iv. 143; probably the Kadytis of Herodotus, taken by Pharaoh Necho, 252 *note* 4, 258; Egyptians advance from, against the Chaldeans, 261; on the Idumean boundary, v. 81 *note* 1; destroyed by Alexander and rebuilt, 236; besieged by Alexander Jannæus, 387 sq., 390; and destroyed, 388; made a free city, 455; demolished, vii. 507
Gazara, in 2 Macc x. 32, v. 313 *note* 7
Gazara, west of Jerusalem, v. 311 *note* 1; fortified by Bacchides, 325 *note* 2; conquered by Simon, 335; occupied by John Hyrcanus, 339, 343, 350
Gazer, Gezara, v. 311 *note* 1, vii. 554. See *Geshur*
Gazerites. See *Geshur*
Geba, in the north of the kingdom of Judah, iv. 3 *note* 1; fortified by Asa, 35
Geba, in Galilee, v. 476 *note* 3
Gebal, a Phœnician city celebrated for its science, ii. 293, iii. 226
Gedaliah, son of Ahikam, settles at Mizpah, iv. 275; assassinated by Ishmael, 276
Gehazi, a disciple of Elisha, iv. 83; sent by him to hold his staff over the son of the Shunammite woman, 85; the leprosy of Naaman cast on him by Elisha's curse, 86; his inferiority to Elisha, 128
Gehenna. See *Hinnom*
Gehinnom, the name given to hell, iv. 209. See *Hinnom*
Gemara, vi. 15
Genath, or Garden Gate, in Jerusalem, vii. 583
Generosity of David towards his enemies, iii. 94
Genesis, book of, iii. 15; general expression of Messianic hope in, vol. iv. 203 *note* 3; ix. 18–27, 153 *note* 4; x. 8–12, 153 *note* 3, 254 *note* 2; xlix. 10; no Messianic meaning in, 203 *note* 3
Genesis, Parva, i. 201
Genethlialogy. See *Chaldean Philosophy*
Gennesareth, the plain of, vi. 254
Gentiles. See *Heathen*
Genubath, son of the Edomite prince Hadad, iii. 217
Gerar, district, i. 240, 243, 245, 305; Ethiopians pursued to, by Asa, iv. 50
Gerasa, a city east of the Jordan, v. 236; reduced by Alexander Jannæus, 391; mentioned, vii. 507
Gerasa, another reading for *Gergasa*, vi. 317
Gergesa, a town on east of lake of Galilee, vi. 317; the demoniac of, 317 sq.
Gérîm, treatment of, enjoined by Deuteronomy, iv. 224
Gerizim, Mount, ii. 279; temple on, v. 214 sqq.; reference to, in Deuteronomy, 218; substituted for Ebal in the Samaritan Pentateuch, 219; changed to one of Zeus Xenius, 298; destroyed by John Hyrcanus, 350; dispute in Alexandria about its pre-eminence, 353 sq.; Romans massacred on, 403; the sacred vessels of temple supposed to be buried there, vi. 69 sq. Samaritans assume threatening position to Romans on, vii. 547; representation of on coins, viii. 290
Germans, mercenaries of Herod, v. 420
Geshur, or Gazer, city and principality in the south, i. 231, ii. 328–30
Geshur, principality in the north-east, ii. 302
Geshur, king of, iii. 115; kingdom of, Absalom takes refuge in, 172, 175; land of, Ish bosheth king over, 112
Gethsemane, garden of, on western slope of Olivet, vi. 423; scene of Christ's agony, 423; various representations of scene in Gospels, 424 sq.
Gezer, west of Jerusalem, Philistines pursued to, iii. 147, 148; revolts against Solomon, 218; captured by the king of Egypt, 221; fortified by Solomon, 259. See *Geshur*
Gibbethon, occupied by the Philistines, besieged by Nadab, iv. 32; by Elah, 35
Gibborim, the, regiment of, iii. 139, 143; accompany David on his flight from Jerusalem, 179 sq.; employed to quell Sheba's revolt, 193; support Solomon's claim, 210; Solomon's guards, 257; iv. 135 *note* 3
Gibeah of Benjamin, probably the present Geba, iii. 22 *note* 1
Gibeah (Gabath) of Saul, his residence, iii. 19, 22, 48, 133; seat of his government, 82, 103; troops stationed at, under Jonathan, 30, vii. 589
Gibeah, town; crime there and its chastisement, ii. 352 sq.
Gibeah, Uriel of, iv. 47 *note* 8, 50 *note* 1
Gibeon, ii. 251, 415; encounter between Abner and Joab at, iii. 114; ancient tabernacle remains at, 125, 134; defeat of the Philistines at, 147; its situation, 147 *note* 6; murder of Amasa at, 194; tabernacle removed from, 245; God appears to Solomon at, 316 sq.
Gibeon (Gabao), place six miles from Jerusalem, vii. 512
Gibeonites, the, Saul's cruelty to, iii. 135 sq.; revenge on Saul's descendants, 136

GID

Gideon, judge, ii. 379–88; his sons, 388–90
Gihon, valley of, west of Jerusalem, iii. 124
Gihon, well of, north of Jerusalem, iii. 210 *note* 1, 253 sq.
Gilboa, Mount, defeat of Saul at, iii. 106
Gilead, district, i. 347, 356, ii. 300 sq., 322, 344; in a proverb, 384
Gilead, east of the Jordan, iii. 162; occupied by Absalom, 185, iv. 64; the Ammonites in, in the reign of Jehoahaz, 121; native country of Hosea, 131; seeks Uzziah's protection, 144 *note* 8; outrages in, before it submitted to Uzziah, 155; native country of Pekah, 157
Gilgal, on the south-west bank of the Jordan, ii. 244–46, 250, 262, 374; assembly at, iii. 25, 28; political and religious importance of, 29; Saul sacrifices at, 38; incorporated in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 2; sons of the prophets in, 80; Elisha assists the disciples of the prophets in, 85 sq.; Elijah at, 110; the centre of heathen worship under Jeroboam II., 126 *note* 6; residence of Hosea at, 131
Giloh, city of Judah, iii. 176, 178
Ginæa, Samaritan village, Betylûa near to, v. 476 *note* 3, vii. 418
Ginath, father of Tibni, iv. 37
Girgashites, i. 232
Giskhala, fortress of, vii. 535 sq.
Gitta, a fortress occupied by Machæras, v. 415
Gittite style of music, iii. 101
Gittôn, native place of Simon Magus, vii. 179
Glaphyra, daughter of Archelaus, married to Alexander, v. 439, 442, 443; charged with intending to flee to Archelaus, 443; her marriage with Juba, 458; and with Archelaus, *ibid.*; her death, *ibid.*
Gnosis, first signs of, vii. 182; Philo the originator of, 211 sq., 218; its origin, viii. 84 sq., 92 sq, 130 sq.; of the epistle of Barnabas, 113; use and abuse of, 127 sq., 139 sq.; as Gnosticism, 130 sq.; dangers of, 139 sq.; in Clemens Romanus, 211
God of the Patriarchs, i. 317–23, 333–35, ii. 37
Goddess of love, the, worship of, in Jerusalem, forbidden by Asa, iv. 49
Gods, names of, their employment, i. 94, 103, 113 sq., 133, 154 sq., 168, 317–23, ii. 37, 122 sq., 155–58, 380
Goetes. See *Christ*
Golgotha and the sepulchre of Christ, sepulchres described in Tobler's work on, vii. 62; Church of the Holy Sepulchre not on site of Christ's sepulchre, 62, 584. See *Gareb*

GUR

Goliath, narratives of his combat with David, iii. 69 sqq.
Goliath of Gath, slain by Elhanan, iii. 70, 148
Goren-Nachon, afterwards called Perez-Uzzah, iii. 126
Gorgias, a Syrian general, his first campaign against Judas Maccabæus, v. 310 sq.; defeats a band of priests at Mareshah, 315
Gorothai, or Gorthai, founder of Samaritan sect, viii. 96 sq.
Goshen, land of, i. 406 sq., ii. 6, 12
Gospel, the, the announcement of the actual presence of the kingdom of God, vi. 202 sq.
Gospels, generally, viii. 244; in the Canon, 355 sq. See *John*
Gothic kings in Spain, possessed Solomon's golden table, iii. 319
Gotholiah, Hellenistic form of Athaliah, iv. 63 *note* 1
Governors, Roman, vi. 61 sq.; of Judea, Council of, vii. 246; the successor of Pilate, 240; after Agrippa I.'s death, 273, 409 sq., 483 sq.
Gozan, in Mesopotamia, conquered by the Assyrians, iv. 150
Gozan, river, south of the lake of Ourmia, deportation of the Israelites to, iv. 165
γραμματεύς, an officer at eastern courts, iii. 267 *note* 5
Grapte, Princess of Adiabene, built a royal palace in Jerusalem, vii. 405, 571
Gratus, an officer of Archelaus, v. 452
Gratus, Valerius, Roman governor, vi. 64
Great Assembly, the. See *Assembly*
'Great King.' See '*King of Kings*'
Grecian state, resemblance of the kingdom of Judah to a, iv. 2 *note* 3
Greek Bible, origin of the, v. 249 sqq., 472. See *Septuagint* and *Aquila*
Greek culture, influx of, v. 235 sqq.
Greek dramas and epics composed by Judeans, v. 260 sq., 417 *note* 3
Greek names adopted in place of Hebrew, v. 269, 319 *note* 6
Greek philosophy. See *Philo*
Greeks, the, in Asia Minor, assist the Chittites to gain their independence, iv. 162; their temptation of Christ, vi. 403 sq.
Grove, the sacred, in the temple, iii. 245
Groves connected with the 'heights,' iii. 306
Gur, a hill, before the town of Ibleam, iv. 93

Habakkuk, a prophet of Judah, belonged to the priesthood, iv. 249; his description of the Chaldeans, 256; his ministry and teachings, 260 sq.; his style, 280, 283; the prophet, legend about him in Dan Apocr., v. 460
Habakkuk, book of, ii. 6–19, iii. 3–15, vol. iv. 283 *note* 3, iii. vol. v. 192 *note* 1
Habor, north of Nineveh, deportation of Israelites to, iv. 165
Hachilah, hill of, in the wilderness of Ziph, iii. 96
Hachmoni, father of Jashobeam, iii. 141
Hadad, prince of Edom, i. 76, ii. 336, iii. 217
Hadadezer, king of Zobah, iii. 150; assists the Ammonites, 152; defeated by Joab, 155; by David, 156; golden arms of his body-guard, 264
Hadadrimmon, city of, iv. 242
Hadoram, son of Toi, king of Hamath, carries presents to David, iii. 156
Hadrian's treatment of Christians, viii. 230 sq.; of Judeans, 275 sq., 278 sq.
Hadrumetum. See *Adramyttium*
Hagar, i. 293, 315
Haggai, prophesies in the reign of Darius, v. 109, 111; his prophetic power, 175; his style, 188
Haggith, wife of David, mother of Adonijah, iii. 209
Hagiocracy, the, its origin and nature, v. 53 sqq.; its power, 61; its dangers, 63 sq.; its progressive development, 66; in the Persian age, 69; in the Greek age, 70; under the Roman supremacy, 70; under the Persians, 75 sqq.; its subsequent development, 139; influence of Ezra and Nehemiah on, 165 sqq.; its weakness, 193 sqq.; its reactionary tendencies, 200 sqq.; relation of Herod to, 421; its relation to the Roman government, vi. 45 sq.; to the Schools of Law and the people, 87 sq., to Christ, 232 sq., 286 sq., 345 sq., 372 sq., 398 sq.; its attitude towards the Apostles and Christians generally, vii. 149 sq, 155 sq.; under Agrippa I., 268 sq.; towards Paul, 364, 433; revival of, in Rabbinism, viii. 29 sq.
Halah, north of Nineveh, deportation of Israelites to, iv. 165
Halakha, viii. 42
Halamath, its situation, iii. 153, 155
Haleb (Aleppo), identified by Jews of the Middle Ages with Zobah, iii. 153
Halicarnassus, Judeans in, v. 239; decree in favour of the Judeans, 364
Ham, son of Noah, i. 238, 240 sq., 279 sqq.; the descendants of, iv. 153
Haman, mentioned in the book of Tobit, v. 212 *note* 5; name of Agagite applied to, 230 *note* 1. See *Esther, book of*

Hamath, grandfather of Jonadab, iv. 79 *note* 4
Hamath, kingdom of, on the Orontes, ii. 294, iii. 154, 156; attempts to revolt under Solomon, 218; conquered by Solomon, 220, 261; reconquered by Jeroboam II., iv. 124; conquered by Tiglath-Pileser, 151; overthrown by the Assyrians, 161; residence of exiled Israelites in, 165; settlers from, sent into Samaria, 216; subdued by Pharaoh Necho, 251
'Hamath the great,' Amos vi. 2, its probable situation, iv. 124 *note* 3
Hammon, for Baal-hamon, iii. 257 *note* 3
Hanameel, cousin of Jeremiah, negotiates with him about an estate, iv. 273
Hanan, son of Igdaliah, a prophet and teacher in Jerusalem, iii. 14 *note* 1, 240
Hanani, prophet of Judah under Abijah, iv. 49; condemns Asa for calling in the aid of the Aramean king, 52
Hanani, the relative of Nehemiah, v. 148 *note* 3
Hananiah, a prophet at Jerusalem, opposed by Jeremiah, iv. 267, 272 *note* 1
Hananiah, captain of the fortifications at Jerusalem under Nehemiah, v. 158
Hands, imposition of, in Christian church, vii. 135 sq.; amongst Rabbis, viii. 31; forbidden by Romans, 292
Hanes, a city of Egypt, iv. 180 *note* 1
Hannah, the song of victory put into the mouth of, 1 Sam. ii., its origin and date, iv. 33 *note* 4, 43
Hanoch. See *Enoch*
Hanun succeeds Nahash, king of Ammon, iii. 151; insults David, 152; his daughter Naamah married to Solomon, 312 *note* 3
Hara, Aramean name for Media, iv. 165 *note* 1
Haran, in Mesopotamia, conquered by the Assyrians, iv. 150
Haran, son of Terah, i. 287
Harem, the royal, under Solomon, iii. 250, 271
Hareth, forest of, in Judah, iii. 89
Harran (Haran), or Charrae, in Mesopotamia, i. 287, 342, 354 sqq.
Hauran, land, ii. 296 *note* 5, 301; towns in, subdued by Alexander Jannæus, v. 391
Havilah, Amalekites defeated at, by Saul, iii. 38
Havilah, in the east, its position, iii. 264 *note* 2
Hazael, an Aramean general, sent by Benhadad to consult Elisha, iv. 93 receives intelligence from him of his career, 87; becomes king of Damascus, 93; re-establishes the supremacy of the Aramean kingdom, 120; liberates

Gath, 137; presses forward to Jerusalem, 138; antiquity and sanctity of his name, 137 *note* 4
Haziz, pass of, in Judah, iv. 55
Hazor, town, ii. 250, 253, 326; fortified by Solomon, iii. 259
Healing, Christ's works of, vi. 221–26
Healing, works of, performed by the Apostles, vii. 113 sq.; by Paul at Ephesus, 391
Heathen, the, Christ's relation to, 235 sq.; sacrifices of, at Jerusalem, v. 80, 82; Christianity taken to them, vii. 175 sq.; the difficulties in the way of that, 189 sq.; the earlier facilities preparing for their admission, 299; controversy connected therewith, 351-60; its new and increased violence, 382 sq.
Heathen-Christians, Cornelius, vii. 187 sq.; churches of, in Cyprus and Asia Minor, 351 sq.; admonitions to, in epistle to Hebrews, 474 sq.; their predominance, viii. 105 sq.
Heathen governments, treatment of Christians by, viii. 218 sq., 223 sq.
Heathen princes, sacrifices for, in the temple, vii. 309; abolished by Zealots, 502; relation of Christians to heathen governments, 462 sq., 467 sq.; heathen princes converted to Judeanism, 407
Hebrew historical composition, commencement of, i. 45–53; early history of, 61–198; oldest works of, 64–74; writing, 47–51
Hebrew language, modified by the intrusion of Aramaic elements, iv. 280; the new growth of, v. 181 sq.; Rabbinical, origin of, 182; when first employed in literature, 464 *note* 3
Hebrew writing, ii. 7 sq.; written character displaced by Aramaic, viii. 320
Hebrews, i. 254 sqq., 268 sq.; their derivation, 277–87, 284 sq.; application of the name, v. 199 *note* 3
Hebrews, epistle to the, its origin, subject-matter, plan, and value, vii. 476 sq.; place of in the Canon, viii. 253; Gospel according to the, 151
Hebron, in the south of Judah, i. 305 sq., ii. 285, iii. 86 *note* 3; David, king, at, 109; place of meeting for the national assembly, 119, 312; outbreak of Absalom's rebellion at, 178; the valley of blessing near, iv. 56 *note* 1; in the hands of the Idumeans, v. 81; regained by the Judeans, 82; captured by Judas Maccabæus, 315
Hecatæus of Abdera, i. 203, ii. 91 sqq., v. 246 *note* 1, 247 sq., 432 *note* 1
Hegesippus, the *De Bello Judaico* wrongly ascribed to him, v. 343 *note* 1; first after Luke to write history of early church, vii. 35; account of James, the Lord's brother, by, 170; his History of the Church, viii. 12
'Heights,' adopted in Israel, iii. 316; house of the, at Bethel, iv. 27; whether they were removed from Judah, by Asa, 49 *note* 2; and by Jehoshaphat, *ibid.*; their destruction enjoined in Deuteronomy, 226; and effected by Josiah, 238
Helena, queen of Adiabene, converted to Judeanism, vii. 403 sq.; her palace, &c., in Jerusalem, 405
Helena, companion of Simon Magus, viii. 89
Hellenism, the Judean, v. 255 sqq.; reception of, by Rabbis, viii. 43 sq.
Hellenists as Christians, vii. 133 sq. 157; Hellenistic culture, 197 sq.; the last of them, viii. 47; their Canon, 341 sq. See *Greeks*
Heliodorus, minister of Seleucus Philopator, attempts to enter the temple at Jerusalem, v. 292; reigns for a short period, *ibid.*; alluded to in Daniel, vii. 24, 304 *note* 1; legend about him in 2 Macc., 460
Heman, a musician, iii. 248; and a sage, 278
Hemero-baptists, Judean sect, viii. 121
Hena, destroyed by the Assyrians, iv. 162 *note* 4
Hepher, land of, in the tribe of Manasseh, iii. 295 *note* 5
Herennius Capito, Roman governor of Jamnia, vii. 239, 245
Hermas, Elder of the Church at Rome, viii. 234 sq.
'Hermas, the Shepherd of,' viii. 232–39; recent editions of the work, 238
Hermogenes, historical writer, viii. 62
Hermon, northern boundary of the area of David's census, iii. 162
Herod Antipas, son of Herod by Simon's daughter, disinherited, v. 447; left tetrarch of Galilee and Perœa, 449; proceeds to Rome, 451; taxes demanded by Augustus, 455. See *Antipas*
Herod, king of Chalcis, vii. 259, 273; steward of the temple, 413 sq.; his death, 420
Herod the Great, second son of Antipater, v. 397, 406; made governor of Galilee, 406; clears Galilee of robbers, 407; behaviour before the Synedrium, *ibid.*; relations with Cassius, *ibid.*; betrothed to Mariamne, 408; defeats Antigonus, 408 sq.; his friendship with Antony, 410; his exertions on behalf of the heathen, 410 *note* 3, 420; besieged in Jerusalem by the Parthians, 411; his flight, 412; reaches Rome, 413; lands at Ptolemais, *ibid.*; subdues Galilee, 413; applies fire to the caves there,

ibid. note 2; enforces tranquillity throughout the country, 414; visits Antony at Samosata, 415; cruelty at Jericho, *ibid.*; besieges Jerusalem, marries Mariamne, 416; attains supreme power, 417 sqq.; his foreign mercenaries, 420; his relation to the Hagiocracy, 421; induces Hyrcanus to return, 423; appoints Aristobulus high-priest, 424; has him strangled at Jericho. 424 sq.; appears before Antony, 425; puts Joseph, husband of Salômê, to death, *ibid.*; cession of various districts to Cleopatra, *ibid.*; campaign east of the Jordan, 426; executes Hyrcanus, 427; conditions of his vassalship to Rome, 427 *note* 3; recognised by Octavian, 427; executes Mariamne, 428; and Alexandra, 429; establishes public games, 429 sq.; his fortresses, 430; erects Cæsarea, 431; relieves the Judeans in famine, 431 sq.; erects the temple, 433; and a palace, 434 sq.; and various fortresses, 435; his friendship with Augustus and Agrippa, 436; internal administration, 437; partiality for Antipater, 439; arrangements for the succession, 440; growing suspicions of Alexander and Aristobulus, 441 sq.; campaign against the Arabians, 442 sq.; fines the Pharisees, 445; recalls Antipater, 446 sq.; disinherits his son Herod, 447; arrests Antipater, *ibid.*; his last illness, 448; executes Antipater, *ibid.*; his death, 449; provisions of his will, 449 sq.; buried in Herodium, 450; his attitude towards the Judeans, 458; and towards heathenism, 459; his four surviving sons, vi. 69; census under, 156

Herods, the younger, vii. 236 sq.; three who side with the national cause, 560; the end of the, viii. 19 sq. See *Costobar* and *Saul*

Herodians, the, adherents of the Herodean royal house, their origin, v. 409, vi. 73 sq.; plan with their enemies the Pharisees the destruction of Christ, 292; the leaven of, 349; vii. 261

Herodias, wife of the son of Herod, living in a private station, later of Antipas, vi. 77 sq.; procures the death of the Baptist, 200; her ambition and defeat, vii. 241 sq.

Herodium, a fortress erected by Herod, v. 435; Herod buried in, 450; vii. 573, 613

Heroöpolis, city, ii. 11–13

Heshbon, city east of the Jordan, ii. 205–207, 295, 298; castle of Hyrcanus near, v. 272; captured by Alexander Jannæus, 391; fortified by Herod, 430

Hezekiah, a robber in Galilee, executed by Herod, v. 407; his son Judas, 453

Hezekiah, son of Ahaz, king of Judah, improves the water supply of Jerusalem, iii. 254, 256; dismisses Shebna, 269; his place of burial, 273; destruction of Samaria in the sixth year of his reign, iv. 117; his character, 172; his position with respect to the Assyrians, 173, 174; fortifies Jerusalem, 175; hastily concludes peace with Shalmaneser, 176; despatches an embassy to Egypt, 176; pays tribute to the Assyrians, 176, 179; strips the gold from the temple and its furniture for Sennacherib, 181; sends ambassadors to Sennacherib at Lachish, 181; receives Sennacherib's letter, 182 sq.; encouraged by Isaiah, 183; his illness and recovery, 185; subdues the Philistines, 186; reception of the Babylonian ambassadors, 187; his death, 189; purification of the temple, and reorganisation of its worship, 189; destruction of heathen sanctuaries, 190; apocryphal stories of him, 190 *note* 3; his poetic compositions, 197; collects the Solomonic proverbs, 198; condition of the kingdom at his death, 207; his sons deported to Babylon, 217; erected a wall round Jerusalem, 218

Hezion, grandfather of Benhadad, king of Damascus, iv. 24 *note* 5

Hiel, rebuilds Jericho, in the reign of Ahab, iv. 39

Hierombal, ii. 380 *note* 1

High Council. See *Council of Seventy*

High priest, his quarters on Zion, iii. 248; made supreme judge in ecclesiastical cases by Jehoshaphat, iv. 54

High priests, ii. 312 sq., 340 sq.; series of, in the age of the Judges, 369 sq., 409 sq.; chronology of, v. 123 sq.; under the Hagiocracy, 203 sqq; their succession, 269 sqq.; at time of Christ, vi. 64; their garments kept in the Castle Antonia, 40, 65; in the trial of Christ, 429 sq.; twenty-eight between 37 B.C. and 70 A.D., vii. 43, 480; arbitrarily appointed by Agrippa I., 263; jealousy in families of, 480; custody of festal attire, 413

High priesthood, the double, under David, iii. 134; confined to the house of Eleazar after the death of Abiathar, 213; hereditary in the house of Joshua, v. 122; Onias does not succeed to, because under age, 270; Aristobulus appointed to, when under age, 424

Hilkiah, a high priest, iii. 268 *note* 5, iv 233; found a book of the law in the temple, 233, 235; assists in the de-

struction of everything connected with idolatry, 238
Hilkiah, son of Onias, an Egyptian Judean officer, v. 357
Hillel, the elder, famous Rabbi: his date, v. 13 sq.; identical with Pollion in *Josephus*, 16–19; his descent, 19 sq.; his character, 21 sq.; his philosophy, 24 sq.; true Rabbi and Pharisee, 25 sq.; his Biblical studies, 29 sq.; the school of, viii. 34, 40
Hinnom, valley of, south of Jerusalem, iii. 124, 254 *note 5*; Tophet erected in, iv. 209
Hippicus, a tower at Jerusalem, erected by Herod, v. 435
Hippos, or Hippus, in the southern district of the lake of Galilee, v. 236; ceded to Cleopatra, 425 *note* 2; made a free city, 455; Judean rising at, vii. 507
Hiram, a Phœnician artist, iii. 227; his metal work, 241 *note 5*
Hiram, or Hirom, king of Tyre, assists Solomon in the erection of the temple, iii. 226 sqq.; exchanges problems with him, 277; receives twenty cities in payment, 292; whether Solomon married his daughter, 297 *note* 2, iv. 300
Historian, the court, under the kings, iii. 270
Historical composition, progress of the art of, iii. 282; development of, in Judah, in the first period, iv. 59; in the second, 199 sq.; in the last age of the kingdom, 283 sq. See *Hebrew Historical Composition*
Historical literature, want of, under the Persians, v. 76; historical composition in the Persian age, 190 sq.; in the later Greek age, 462 sqq.
History, oldest works of, i. 64–74; sources of history of the final period, viii. 11 sq.; growing degeneracy of, amongst the Rabbis, 42 sq.; of Israel, as written by Greek and Roman writers, 62 sq.; by Hebrew writers, 66 sq.
Hittite kings, their traffic in horses, iii. 262
Hittites, i. 235, 238
Hivvites, i. 237
Hobab (Jethro), ii. 25, 43–46
Holiness, ii. 136–39; idea of, its power and influence, v. 58 sqq. See *Hagiocracy*
Holofernes, a personage in the book of Judith, v. 476; a general under Demetrius I., 476 *note* 1
'Holy City,' first occurrence of the name, v. 60 *note* 2
'Holy Land,' used for the first time by Zechariah, v. 60 *note* 3
Holy of Holies, the, in the temple, iii. 235, 238 sq., 242 sq., 246
Holy Place, the, in the temple, iii. 235, 238, 243, 246
Homilies, Clementine, vii. 35, 460
Hophra (Apries), king of Egypt, iv. 269; assists Zedekiah against the Chaldeans, 269
Hor, mountain, ii. 201
Horeb, mountain, ii. 43
Horites, i. 226 sq., 237
Hormah, in the south of Judah, iii. 86 *note* 3
Horon, in Samaria, the residence of Sanballat, v. 153
Horsemen, city of, v. 430
Horses, ii. 130, 155, 241; importation of, from Egypt, under Solomon, iii. 259 sq., 262; use of, in Judah, iv. 58 *note* 2; supply of, obtained from Egypt, 219; forbidden by Deuteronomy, 219 *note 5*
Horses, the sacred, of the sun, kept in the outer court of the temple by Ahaz, iv. 169
Hosea, a prophet of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 9 *note* 1, 129, 131, 133; designates the northern kingdom 'Ephraim,' 5; took refuge from Israel in Judah, 14 *note* 1, 156; calls the God of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes its 'calf,' 37; began to prophesy towards the close of the reign of Jeroboam II., 125; looks for salvation from Judah, 144; discerns the dangers of Judah, 148; foretells the destruction of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes by the Assyrians, 153; his literary and prophetic efforts, 194; his prophetic book, 197; his Messianic anticipations, 203 *note* 2; proclaimed the new truth that love is the highest attribute of God, 223; lamentations over the neglect of the divine utterances, 240
Hoshea, conspires against Pekah, and becomes king of the Ten Tribes, iv. 161; his alliance with Egypt, 163, 176; seized and imprisoned by Shalmaneser, 164
'House of Disobedience,' name applied by Ezekiel instead of 'house of Israel,' iv. 245
'House of the heights,' the, at Bethel, iv. 27
Hozai, a prophet in Jerusalem, iv. 218 *note* 1, 220
Huldah, wife of a keeper of the royal ordnance under Josiah, her oracle, iv. 234
Human sacrifices offered by the king of Moab, iv. 90; by Ahaz, 169; by Manasseh, 209
Hur, ii. 25, 29 *note*

HUS

Husâ-â, Wâdi, perhaps to be identified with Haziz, iv. 55 *note* 2
Hushai, David's 'friend,' iii. 181; received by Absalom, 182; frustrates Ahithophel's counsel, 183
Hyksôs, i. 389 sqq.
Hymns, use of, in public worship, v. 145. See *Lyrics*
Hypsuranius, i. 233 sq.
Hyrcania, or Hyrcanium, a castle erected by John Hyrcanus, v. 382; given up to the Pharisees, 394; held by a sister of Antigonus and besieged by Herod, 425; refitted by him, 435; Antipater buried at, 449
Hyrcania, Judeans deported to, in the reign of Artaxerxes III., v. 206; Judeans in, 342 *note* 2
Hyrcanus I. See *John Hyrcanus*
Hyrcanus II., son of Alexander Jannæus, made high-priest, v. 393; defeated at Jericho, 395; his compact with Aristobulus, 396; flees to Aretas at Petra, 397; retains territory in the south, 398; his cause pleaded before Pompey at Damascus, 399; made high-priest and Ethnarch, 400; duration of his reign, 401 *note* 3; only spiritual office left to him by Gabinius, 402; confirmed in it by Cæsar, 404; appointed king by Antony, 410; sent away to Parthia by Herod, 412; returns to Jerusalem, 423; executed by Herod, 427
Hyrcanus, high priest, opened the tomb of David, iii. 228 *note* 1
Hyrcanus, son of Joseph, his residence in Egypt, v. 271, 285 *note* 1; his wars and death, 272
Hyrcanus, origin of the surname, v. 342 *note* 2.

Iapetus. See *Japheth*
Ibleam, a town in Israel, iv. 98; its situation, 98 *note* 1
Ibzan, judge, ii. 366, 388
Ichabod, grandson of Eli, ii. 413
Iddo, a prophet under Solomon, iii. 301
Idolatry, in the time of Moses, ii. 181–85; in that of the Judges, 345–49, 388
Idumea, the name, employed for Judea, v. 396 sq.
Idumea, rising in, suppressed by Varus, v. 454. See *Edom*
Idumea, 'the plains of,' 1 Macc. iv. 15, v. 311 *note* 1
Idumeans, the, their jealousy of the Israelites, v. 80; their possessions in Judah, 81; subsequent loss of their acquisitions, 82 sq.; increased power after the destruction of Jerusalem, 89; their relations with Jerusalem, 121; operations of Judas Maccabæus against,

ISA

313; subdued by John Hyrcanus, 350 sq., 353; their ascendency under Antipater and Herod, 396 sq.; take part in war against Rome, vii. 563 sq.; relations to Simon, son of Giora, 569; in the defence of Jerusalem, 592; seek to surrender to Titus, 607. See *Edom*
Ignatius, bishop and martyr, viii. 216 sq.; epistles of, 221 sq.
Ijon, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, subdued by Baasha, iv. 34 *note* 3
Image-worship, ii. 124 sq.; of Jahveh, introduced in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 8, 26; how regarded by the earlier prophets, 65; denounced by Amos, 131; by Hosea, 27, 132; revived after the new settlement in Samaria, 217; vii. 245, 534; Caligula's statue, vii. 245 sq.; Josephus destroys Tetrarch's palace at Tiberias on account of animal figures, 534. See *Idolatry*
Images, feeling with regard to in Jerusalem, vi. 61 sq., 65 sq.
Imlah, father of Micaiah, iv. 76
Immortality, ii. 133–35; doctrine of, in the book of Job, iv. 213 *note* 1; in the book of Daniel, v. 305; in the second book of Maccabees, 466; in the Wisdom of Solomon, 481
India, trade with, under Solomon, iii. 264; Judeans in, v. 239
Infantry regiments of Josiah sent to Egypt, iv. 219
Ionians, the, captives from Judah sold to, in the time of Joel, iv. 138 *note* 2; alluded to in Zech. ix. 13, 162 *note* 3
Ira, an officer at David's court, iii. 268 *note* 6
Isaac, the Patriarch, i. 292 sq., 298, 326, 332 sq., 338–41
Isaac, designation of the northern kingdom, iv. 5
Isaiah, the prophet, procures the dismissal of Shebna, iii. 269; designates the northern kingdom 'Ephraim,' iv. 5 *note* 1; prophesies of the Assyrians, 153, 170, 174; denounces the Ephraimites and Syrians, 159, 170; publication of his earliest prophetic work, 167 *note* 2; nature of his ministry, 168, 172; encourages Ahaz, 170; proclaims the fall of Samaria and Damascus, 170; announces the overthrow of surrounding states, 174; protests against the Egyptian alliance, 177, 179; encourages Hezekiah to resist Sennacherib, 182; oracle against Sennacherib, 183; narrative of his cure of Hezekiah, 186; warns Hezekiah against the Babylonian alliance, 187 sq.; his last utterance, 189; and death, 189; his prophetic compositions, 196 *note* 3, 197; tradition of his martyrdom, 211 *note* 3; his

conception of the Messianic idea, 201 sq., 291; predicts the return of the Ten Tribes, v. 90; Messianic prophecies of, vi. 105 sq., 110
Isaiah, book of, i., vol. iv., 176 *note* 1, 196 *note* 3; ii. v., 167 *note* 2, 196 *note* 3; vi.–ix. 6, 167 *note* 2, 170 *note* 4, 196 *note* 3; ix. 7–x. 4, 167 *note* 2, 196 *note* 3, 198 *note* 9; x. 5–14, 179 *note* 1; x. 5–xii., 196 *note* 3; xiv. 24–27, *ibid.*; xiv. 28–xvi., 194 *note* 4, 196 *note* 3; xvi. 1–6, 194 *note* 5; xvii. 1–11, 196 *note* 3; xvii. 12–xviii., *ibid.*; xviii., 179 *note* 4; xix., 189 *note* 1, 194 *note* 5, 196 *note* 3; xx., 179 *note* 3, 196 *note* 3; xxi. 11–17, 194 *note* 5, 196 *note* 3; xxii. 1–14, 176 *note* 1; xxii., xxiii., 196 *note* 3; xxviii.–xxxii., 177 *note* 1, 196 *note* 3; xxxii. 1–8, 205 *note* 1; xxxiii., 181 *note* 5, 196 *note* 3; xxxvi.–xxxix., 181 *note* 1; xxxviii., 198 *note* 4, 278 *note* 2; xxxviii., 9–20, 172 *note* 6; xl. 1 sq., 207 *note* 3; lii. 13–liii. 12, *ibid.*, 211 *note* 5, 212 *note* 2; lvi. 8–lvii. 11, 207 *note* 3; xi. 15, vol. v. 90 *note* 1; xiii. 2–xiv. 23, 42 *note* 2; xiv. 4–23, 7 *note* 3; xix., 27 *note* 6. 356; xxi. 9, 40 *note* 2; xxi. 1–10, 41, 42 *note* 1; xxiv.–xxvii., 106 *note* 3; xxiv. 21 sq., 184 *note* 1; xxxiv., xxxv., 47 *note* 2; xl.–lxvi., 15 *note* 4, 23 *note* 1, 25 *note* 1, 47 *note* 1; xl.–xlviii., 15 *note* 4, 16 *note* 1, 45 *note* 3; xli., 7 *note* 3; xliii. 1–4, 12 *note* 4; xlvi., 7 *note* 3; xlvii., 24 *note* 5; xlix.–lxvi., 15 *note* 4; xlix.–lxiii. 6, 46 *note* 1; li. 18–20, 17 *note* 1; liv. 9–lv. 13, 12 *note* 4; lv., 23 *note* 1; lviii., 7 *note* 1, 15 *note* 4; lix., 15 *note* 4; lxiii. 1–6, 15 *note* 4, 16 *note* 1; lxiii. 7–lxiv. 11 [12], 15 *note* 4; lxiii. 7–lxvi., 106 *note* 3; lxv., 7 *note* 1; lxv., lxvi., 15 *note* 4; in Canon, vol. viii. 326. See '*Unnamed, the Great*'
Isanas, the army of Pappus at, v. 415
Ishbi-benob, a Philistine giant, his combat with David, iii. 148
Ish-bosheth, son of Saul, reigns over Israel, iii. 109; seat of his government transferred to Mahanaim, 112; his relations with Moab, 150; power of his general Abner, 266 *note* 4; murdered, 118; his murderers punished, 119, 136
Ishmael and Ishmaelites, i. 299, 315 sq., 369
Ishmael, son of Nethaniah, assassinates Gedaliah, iv. 276
Isiris (Isirios), i. 360 sq.
Islam, legends of Solomon, iii. 319
Ismael, high-priest, vii. 602, 616
Israel, as designation of the nation, i. 4 sqq.; preliminary or primeval history of Israel, 256 sqq.; its beginnings, 381–85; its migration to Egypt, 385–407; its rising in Egypt, ii. 34–41; at Sinai, 101–106; settled in Canaan, 238–41, 255–57; Ish-bosheth king over, iii. 112; David, king over, 119, 120 sqq.; intercourse with other nations, 276
Israel (the Ten Tribes), kingdom of, its extent and characteristics, iv. 2 sqq.: its chronology, 20 sqq.; its history during the first century, 23 sqq.; its worship, 27 sq.; condition of the people in, 41 sqq.; labours of Elijah and his successors in, 63 sqq.; great revolution in, under Jehu, 96 sqq.; second period of its history, 114 sqq.; its power under Jeroboam II., 124; dissolution of morals and of prophetism in, 124 sqq.; its fall, 154 sqq.; literary remains of, 194; its sufferings during the Captivity, v. 1 sqq.; treatment by Nabuchodrozzor, 2; many of its members driven to Egypt, from various causes, 3; on the Mediterranean, 4; their communities among the Chaldeans, 5; hopes during the Captivity, 8 sqq.; among the heathen, 19; endeavours to return to the ancient truths, 21; its revolt from heathenism, 25 sq.; its mission to the heathen, 27; intercourse with them, 33; adoption of Chaldean names, *ibid.*; its internal transformation during the exile, 37; its liberation by Cyrus, announced by the Great Unnamed, 45; its deep depression even after the liberation, 64; influence of heathen nations, 65; Messianic hope in, 67, 68, 69; application of the name, 199 *note* 3; the final issues of its national history, viii. 3–9; the three names, Hebrews, Israel, Jews, 307 sq. See *Judeans*
Israel, designation of the northern kingdom, iv. 5
Israel, land of, its boundaries, ii. 303–307
Israel, the Patriarch, i. 292, 298, 341–62, 358
Israelites, first deportation of, by Tiglath-Pileser, iv. 160 sq.; second, under Shalmaneser, 164; their settlement in the eastern provinces of Assyria, 165; prophecy among the exiles, 284
Issachar, tribe, ii. 282, 290–92, 327
Ithamar, his high-priestly family, ii. 409 sq.
Ithmah, a Moabite, iii. 144 *note* 3
Ithobal, king of Tyre, contemporary of Ahab, drought in his reign, iv. 69 *note* 3; his date, 300

Iturea, country of Sohemus, vii. 328
Itureans, the, an Arab tribe, vanquished by Aristobulus, v. 385
Ittai, of Gath, iii. 144 *note* 3; accompanies David on his flight from Jerusalem, 179; commands a division of the army against Absalom, 186
Ivah, destroyed by the Assyrians, iv. 162 *note* 4; settlers from, sent to Samaria, 216
Izates, king of Adiabene, converted to Judeanism, vii. 403 sq.

Jabbok, the, tributary of the Jordan, iii. 112 *note* 1
Jabesh, city of, Kenites in, iv. 79 *note* 4
Jabesh, father of Shallum, iv. 154
Jabesh Gilead, besieged by Nahash, iii. 24; Saul's aid to the inhabitants of, 44; citizens of, rescue Saul's body, 110, 137
Jabin, king, ii. 326
Jabneh, or Jabne, or Jamnia, a city of the ancient Philistia, conquered by Uzziah, iv. 143; v. 315, 329; conquest of, by Simon, 335 *note* 4; occupied by Cendebæus, 339; bequeathed by Herod to Salômê, 450; Agrippa arrested at, by governor of, vii. 238 sq.; Caligula's statue there, 244 sq.; Vespasian's troops there, 552; Rabbinic school there, viii. 33
Jachin, name of one of the pillars of Solomon's temple, iii. 237
Jacob, designation of the northern kingdom, iv. 5; and of Judah, 5 *note* 1
Jacob, the Patriarch (see also *Israel*), i. 305 sq., 341–62; his twelve sons or tribes, 362–81; their original composition, 371 sqq.
Jaddûa, son of John, high-priest at the time of Alexander, v. 206, 213 sq.; the last high-priest mentioned in the Old Testament, 270
Jadduah, high-priest, i. 172
Jadon, name given by Josephus to the prophet who announced the destruction of the altar at Bethel, iv. 30 *note* 5
Jael, judge, ii. 365
Jael, wife of Heber, ii. 376 sq.
Jahaz, or Jahza, city, ii. 209
Jahaziel, a Levite, predicts victory for Jehoshaphat, iv. 55
'Jahveh's Anointed,' position of the king as, iii. 6, 45, 65, 81, 95, 107
Jahveh, Book of the Wars of, i. 66–8
Jahveh, Community of. See *Community*
'Jahveh,' 'Day of,' iv. 127
Jahveh, image-worship of, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 8, 26; how regarded by the earlier prophets, 65; denounced by Amos, 131; by Hosea, 27, 132; revived after the new settlement in Samaria, 217
Jahveh (*Jehovah*), ii. 37, 155–58; as Deliverer, 110 sq.; as One, 120–23; as incapable of plastic representation, 123–28; as spiritual, 128–31; as the constant Saviour, 131 sq.; his Name, 155–58
'Jahveh of Armies' [A.V. Lord of Hosts], meaning of, iii. 62, 73
Jahveh, use of, in compound names, iii. 168 *note* 1; disuse of the name of, v. 198 sq.
Jahvism, ii. 113 sq.; its fundamental idea, 98–120; consequences of this idea, 120–35
Jair, father of Elhanan, iii. 70
Jair, judge, ii. 365 sq., 370, 389
Jair, townships of, i. 378, ii. 296, 299 sq.
Jairus, Christ restores his daughter, vi. 320
James, the Lord's Brother, the chief elder of the parent church, vii. 167; his ascetic habits, 169; as the first bishop, 171; epistle of, 450 sq.; in the Canon, viii 352 sq.
James, the son of Alphæus, vi. 304
James, the son of Zebedee, vi. 181; John's delicacy in not naming him, 246; becomes a disciple of Christ, 247; his martyrdom, vii. 269
Jamnia. See *Jabneh*
Jannes and Jambres, ii. 89
Japha, south-west of Nazareth, vii. 540, 544
Japheth (Iapetus), i. 279 sqq.
Japho (Joppa), Peter there, vii. 185; Cestius seeks to secure it, 512; Judeans resettle there, 548. See *Joppa*
Jared, Forefather, i. 267
Jasher (the Upright), book of, i. 74, ii. 238
Jashobeam, son of Hachmoni, colonel in David's army, iii. 141
Jason, Greek designation of Jesus, brother of Onias III., v. 294; his flight into Ammon, *ibid.*; attacks Jerusalem, but is compelled to flee, 296; subsequent fate, *ibid.*
Jason, of Cyrene, author of a work on the Maccabean times, v. 465, 467
Jattir, in the south of Judah, iii. 86 *note* 3
Jazer, city, ii. 204, 207, 298; conquered by Judas Maccabæus, v. 313
Jazer, land of, iii. 162
Jebus, or Jerusalem, originally a Canaanite fortress, iii. 121
Jebusite, Araunah the, iii. 163
Jedidiah, name conferred on Solomon, iii. 168
Jeduthun, a temple musician, iii. 248
Jehoahaz, son of Jehoram, king of Judah,

JEH

takes the name of Ahaziah on his accession, iv. 95
Jehoahaz (Shallum), son of Josiah, king of Judah, iv. 251; after a reign of three months, carried captive to Egypt, 252
Jehoahaz, son of Jehu, king of the Ten Tribes, iv. 120; cedes cities west of the Jordan to Benhadad, 121; length of his reign, 121
Jehoiachin (or Conian), king of Judah, i. 160; resists the Chaldeans, iv. 263; carried into exile, 264, 298; in spite of his imprisonment looked on as the true representative of David's house, 295; condition of the people banished with him, v. 5; how treated, 6; released from prison by Evil Merodach, 18; place of his burial, iii. 273 *note* 6
Jehoiada, high-priest at Jerusalem, conspires against Athaliah, iv. 135; and places Joash on the *throne*, 136; his death, 141
Jehoiakim (Eliakim), brother of Jehoahaz, king of Judah, re-introduces foreign heathen rites, iv. 252; submits to the Chaldean supremacy, 259; his revolt, 261; repairs to the Chaldean camp for negotiations, 262; is assassinated, 262
Jehoram, son of Ahab, king of the Ten Tribes, succeeds Ahaziah, iv. 78; removes the statue of Baal from the temple at Samaria, 78; length of his reign, 21 sq., 87; attacks Moab, 88; withdraws with his allies, 90; captures Ramoth in Gilead, 91; war with the Arameans, 94; wounded near Ramoth, 94; returns to Jezreel, 96, 97; murdered by Jehu, 98
Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, iv. 94; married to Athaliah, 62 sq.; his death, 21, 95
Jehoshaphat, son of Asa, king of Judah, iv. 53; length of his reign, 22, 53; his arrangements for education, 53; and the administration of justice, 54; his wars, 54 sq.; his navigation of the Red Sea, 56, 143; his alliance with the kings of the Ten Tribes, 62; agrees to join Ahab in a campaign against Ramoth in Gilead, 75; whether he joined Jehoram in his campaign against Moab, 88 *note* 1
Jehoshaphat, son of Nimshi, father of Jehu, iv. 96
Jehoshaphat, valley of, iv. 56
Jehovah. See *Jahveh*
Jehozabad, assassinates Joash, iv. 141
Jehu, son of Hanani, a prophet in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, denounces Baasha, iv. 35; subsequently ministers in Judah, 53

JER

Jehu, son of Jehoshaphat, iv. 96; his character, 97; anointed by a disciple of the prophets, 97; saluted as king by his brother officers, 97; hastens to Jezreel, 97; assassinates Jehoram, 98; effects the death of Ahaziah, 98; and of Jezebel, 99; destroys all the members of the house of Ahab, 99; and the friends and priests of Jehoram, 99; has *forty-two* of Ahaziah's relatives executed at Betheked, 100; exterminates the Baal-worship, 100; cedes all the territory east of the Jordan to Hazael, 120; length of his reign, 120; possibly the author of 1 Sam. ii. 1–10, 33 *note* 4; cause of the fall of his house, 35 *note* 3, 133
Jephthah, judge, ii. 392–95; his daughter, 394 sq.
Jerahmeelites, the, in the south of Judah, iii. 86 *note* 3; attacked by David, 102
Jeremiah, a prophet of Judah, his survey of foreign affairs, iv. 196 *note* 1; successive editions of his prophecies, 196 *note* 3; his views of the Egyptian alliance, 219; his earliest utterances, 220; his early prophetic book, 230; his ministry, 231 sq.; the son of a common Levite, 233 *note* 3; first appeared as a prophet at Anathoth, 234; his warnings against false scripturalism, 240; his elegies on Josiah, 243; difficulties of his ministry, 245; belonged to the priesthood, 249; a type of the dissolution of the kingdom, 249; denounced at the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim, 253; description of the Scythians and Chaldeans, 256; predicts the fall of Egypt and the rise of the Chaldean power, and the subjection of Judah by Nabuchodrozzor, 258; compilation and public recital by Baruch of a book of his prophecies, 258; his arrest, 259; his description of Nabuchodrozzor, 260; warns Jehoiakim against revolt, 262; publishes his enlarged prophetic book early in Zedekiah's reign, 267; put in the stocks, 267; opposes Hananiah and warns Zedekiah against resistance, 268; prophetic epistle to the exiles in Babylon, 270; consulted by Zedekiah, 272; again arrested, 273; negotiates with Hanameel about a patrimonial estate, 273; recommends surrender to the Chaldeans, 273; receives permission to remain in the country after the destruction of Jerusalem, 275; and joins Gedaliah, 275; forced to flee to Egypt, 276; tradition that he was stoned there, 276 *note* 3; his language, 279; inserts passages from older works, 280;

his style, 280; proclaims the necessity of a new covenant, 291 sq.; his description of the condition of Israel under the Captivity, v. 5; his position after the destruction of Jerusalem, 11; orthography of his name, 11 *note* 1; his relation to the book of Lamentations, 18; looks for the restoration of Jerusalem, 32; his view of the duration of the Chaldean supremacy, 73 sq.; his hopes of the earlier exiles, 93; said to have removed the holy fire from the temple, 162; tradition of how he saved the ark, 171 *note* 2; simplicity of his imagery, 185

Jeremiah, book of, ii. 3–6, vol. iv. 207 *note* 3; iii.–vi., 230 *note* 4; iv.–vi., 229 *note* 2; xi.–xiii., 263 *note* 4, 267 *note* 2; xiv.–xvii. 18, 267 *note* 4; xvii. 19–xx., *ibid.*; xxi. 1–10, 273 *note* 1; xxii. 10–xxiii, 267 *note* 2; xxiv., 269 *note* 5; xxvi.–xxix., 263 *note* 1; xxvii., xxviii., 268 *note* 3, 272 *note* 1; xxix., 269 *note* 5; xxxii.. xxxiii., 273 *note* 2; xxxiv. 1–7, 274 *note* 1; xxxiv. 8–22, 272 *note* 2; xxxv., 267 *note* 2; xxxvi., *ibid.*; xxxvii. 1–10, 273 *note* 1; xxxvii. 11–21, 273 *note* 2; xxxviii., 274 *note* 1; xl.–xliv., 276 *note* 2; published in an enlarged form during the siege of Babylon, vol. v. 46; its Babylonian editor, 190 *note* 4; iii., 93 *note* 2; x., 7 *note* 1; xxxii., xxviii., 12 *note* 2; xliv., 7 *note* 1; l., li., 24 *note* 5, 46 *note* 3, 47 *note* 1, *note* 2; in the Canon, viii. 327; Lamentations, book of in the Canon, 335, 344

Jeremiah, letter of, a Hellenist production, v. 479

Jericho, its conquest and destruction, ii. 247–50; incorporated in the northern kingdom, iv. 2; rebuilt by Hiel, in the reign of Ahab, 39; sons of the prophets in, 80; well at, improved by Elisha, 85; visited by Elijah before his ascension, 110; captive Judahites sent back to, 160; destroyed in the reign of Artaxerxes III., v. 206; fortified by Bacchides, 325 *note* 2; battle at, between Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, 395; Pompey marches through, 399; made the centre of a district, 403; occupied by the Romans, 414; Herod's cruelty at, 415; murder of Aristobulus at, 424 sq.; palace of Herod at, 436 *note* 2; execution of Matthias and his associates at, 448; representatives of the people shut up in the race course, 448; the deputies released after Herod's death, 449; Herod's palace in, destroyed, 453; buildings of Archelaus at, 456; Christ passes through, vi. 385; cure of Bartimæus, 388; call of Zacchæus there, 388

Jeroboam I., king of the Ten Tribes, his origin, iii. 304; his insurrection, 305; his sojourn in Egypt, 312; returns to Zereda, 313; is chosen king of Israel, 314; reigns twenty-two years, iv. 23; chooses Shechem as his capital, 23; removes the seat of government to Penuel, 23; at length fixes his residence at Tirzah, 23; erects palaces and fortifications at Tirzah, 24; relation of foreign powers to, 24 sq.; establishes centres of Jahveh-worship at Bethel and Dan, 27; forbids the people to visit the temple at Jerusalem, 27; transposes the autumn festival from the seventh to the eighth month, 27; ordains priests at Bethel, 28; his mother, 32 *note* 1; said to have married a sister of the Egyptain queen Thekemina, *ibid.*; his native city, *ibid.*; defeated by Abijah, 48; his death, 32; his neglect of the commands of the Decalogue, 239; fall of his house, 8 *note* 1, 33

Jeroboam II., son of Joash, king of the Ten Tribes, iv. 123 sqq.; length of his reign, 118, 124; his conquests, 124; dissolution of morals and prophetism during his reign, 124 sqq.; banishes Amos from Israel, 133; external condition of the people in his reign, 133

Jerubbaal, epithet of Gideon, ii. 380–83

Jeruel, wilderness of, in Judah, iv. 55

Jerusalem, ii. 77, 81 sq., 251, 284 sqq.; conquest of, by David, iii. 121 sqq.; meaning of the name, 122 *note* 1; its topography, 123 sq.; fortified by David, 124; David's palace in, 249; its water supply, 252 sq.; its walls and gates, 254 *note* 5; additional fortifications of Solomon, 258 sq.; its growing importance, 305 sqq.; importance to it of the permanence of David's house, 311; position of, on the southern border of Benjamin, iv. 4; several times reduced during the period of the monarchy, 14; captured by Egyptian troops in the reign of Rehoboam, 46; attacked by the Philistines in the reign of Jehoram, 94; submits to Joash, king of the Ten Tribes, 142; fortified by Uzziah, 143 sq.; by Jotham, 166; and by Hezekiah, 175; advance of the Assyrians against, under Tartan, 182; additional fortifications of, by Manasseh, 218; besieged by the Scythians in the reign of Josiah, 231; invested by Nabuchodrozzor, surrenders under Jehoiachin, 264; besieged by Nabuchodrozzor, under Zedekiah, 271; the siege raised, 272; re-invested, 273;

breach made by the Chaldeans, 274; the lower city occupied, 274; the walls razed, 275; date of its capture, 298; date of the siege of, by the Assyrians, 299; its condition during the Captivity, v. 6; prophetic expectations of its glory, 32; first occupied on the return of the exiles, 80; its position after the victories of Nabuchodrozzor, 89; its importance as a metropolis, 97 sq.; the settlers at, under Cambyses, 105; under Pseudo-Smerdis, 107 sq.; tranquillity under Darius, 115 sq.; later abbreviation into Solyma, 118, 235 *note* 2; condition of its walls and gates after Zerubbabel, 121, 148 *note* 3; before Nehemiah, 148; arrival of Nehemiah at, 150; the rebuilding of the walls, 151 sq.; actually begun, 154; intended attacks on, 155; walls completed, 157; their consecration, 158; subjugation of, by Alexander, 222; twice occupied by Ptolemy Lagi, 226; called Hieropolis by Philo, 235 *note* 2; walls rebuilt by Simon II., 273 sq.; concessions to, by Antiochus the Great, 284; taken by Scopas, *ibid.*; retaken by Antiochus, *ibid.*; its position under the Seleucidæ, 287; severely treated by Antiochus Epiphanes, 296, 301; captured by Apollonius, and transformed into a heathen city, 297 sq.; fortified and defended by the Syrians, 317; occupied by Bacchides, 320; the citadel occupied by Nicanor's troops, 321; fortified by Bacchides, 325; still occupied by the Syrians, 327; the citadel, besieged by Jonathan, 330, 332; falls into Simon's hands, 335; occupied by John Hyrcanus, 343; besieged by Antiochus of Sidê, 343 sq.; the walls demolished, 344; dispute about its pre-eminence in Alexandria, 353 sq.; besieged by Arabian and Judean troops under Aretas and Hyrcanus II., 398; besieged by Pompey, 399 sq.; captured, and the walls demolished, 400; made the centre of a district by Gabinius, 403; besieged by Herod, 416; captured by Herod, 416; public games, theatre, and amphitheatre, established at, by Herod, 429; Varus suppresses the insurrections at, 452, 454; its privileges under the Romans, vi. 38 sq.; Christ's public entry into, 392 sq.; his visits to, see *Feasts*; attacked by Cestius, vii. 497 sq.; as occupied by the parties of Zealots just before the siege of Titus, 575 sq.; the city as described by Josephus, 580 sq.; its defence and capture, 588 sq.; its restoration as Ælia, viii. 277, 293; whether taken

by Bar-Kokheba, 289; first bishop of Ælia, 302

Jeshanah, a city of Israel, taken by Abijah, iv. 48

Jesse, father of David, iii. 66, 87 *note* 6

Jesus, brother of Onias III., takes the name of Jason, and secures the high-priesthood, v. 294. See *Jason*

Jesus (Joshua), grandson of Eliashib, murdered by his brother John, v. 205

Jesus, same as Joshua, iii. 229

Jesus, son of Gamala, leader of the moderate party, vii. 561 sq.; slain, 564

Jethro. See *Hobab*

Jewish Christians, vii. 361 sq., 383 sq.; in epistle of James, 450; growth of party of, viii. 143 sq.; three parties of, 150 sq.

Jews, application of the name, v. 199 *note* 3; true use of the name, viii. 307; hatred of Christians, 295

Jezebel, a Tyrian princess, wife of Ahab, iv. 39; attempts to destroy the prophets of Jahveh, 66, 104; persuades Ahab to compass the destruction of Naboth, 75; denounced by Elijah, 75; threatens Elijah with death, 107; her influence over Jehoram, 91; perishes in the revolt of Jehu, 98 sq.

Jezreel, a small town of Judah, iii. 99

Jezreel, Philistine victory at, iii. 105; a name for the vale of Galilee, 112 *note* 3; palaces of Ahab in, iv. 40, 71, 74; and in plain of, v. 476 *note* 3

Joab, son of Zeruiah, David's commander-in-chief, iii, 113, 122 *note* 4, 144, 269; assassinates Abner, 117; assists David in laying out Jerusalem, 124; carries out the census, 162; effects the return of Absalom, 173, 175; commands a division of the army against Absalom, 186; despatches Absalom, 187; to be replaced by Amasa, 190; murders Amasa, 194; pursues Sheba and besieges Abel, 195; supports the conspiracy of Adonijah, 210; executed by Benaiah, 214

Joab, well of, iii. 210 *note* 1

Joam, name given by Epiphanius to the prophet who announced the destruction of the altar at Bethel, iv. 30 *note* 5

Joash, son of Ahaziah, king of Judah, saved from the massacre of Athaliah, iv. 134; through the aid of Jehoiada, established on the throne, 126; calamities of his reign, 137 sq.; the drought, 138; the locusts, 138; length of his reign, 139; his repairs of the temple, 139 sq.; his fall, 141, 232; his place of burial, iii. 273 *note* 2

Joash, son of Jehoahaz, king of the Ten Tribes, length of his reign, iv. 118; re-

covers from Benhadad the towns on the west of the Jordan, 122; visits Elisha in his last illness, 123; war with Amaziah, 142; razes part of the wall of Jerusalem, 142
Job, book of, vol. i. 127; vol. iv. 9 *note* 1, 109 *note* 1, 192 *note* 2, 199, 200, 213 *note* 1, 220, 232, 255, 278, 281, 286; xxviii. 1–11, 192 *note* 2; vol. v. 184 *note* 1, 210; supplementary portions of, 189; in Canon, vol. viii. 334
Job, well of, iii. 210 *note* 1
Joehanan Ben Zakhâi, renowned Rabbi, viii. 33
Joel, a prophet of Judah, announces the 'Day of Jahveh,' iv. 127 *note* 3; a contemporary of Elisha, 128; prophesies under Joash, 138 sq.; his literary composition, 197; Messianic prophecies of, vi. 103 sq.
Johanan, eldest brother of Judas Maccabæus, slain at Mêdebâ, v. 324
Johanan, son of Eliashib, founded a hall in the new temple, v. 205 *note* 5
Johanna, wife of Chuza, vi. 305
John, high-priest, grandson of Eliashib, murders his brother Jesus, v. 205
John of Giskhala, vii. 535 sq., 554 sq.; the head of the Learned Zealots, 562 sq.; puts down the Priestly Zealots, 590; his most important military feat, 597; his end, 609 sq.
John Hyrcanus, or Johanan, son of Simon, in the chief command, v. 339; surnamed Hyrcanus, 342; assumes the high-priesthood, and occupies Jerusalem, 343; materials for Josephus' account of, 343 *note* 1; negotiations with Antiochus Sidêtês (Eusebes), 344; opens the tomb of David, *ibid.*; expedition with Antiochus Eusebes, 345, 475 *note* 5; reference to, in the book of Enoch, 347 *note* 2; captures Mêdebâ, 349; and Samega, *ibid.*; sends an embassy to Rome, 352; his general administration, *ibid.*; sends a second embassy to Rome, 364; seeks the friendship of various Greek cities, *ibid.*; his prophetic powers, 384; nominates his wife to supreme power, 385
John, the Apostle, a relative of Jesus, vi. 181; of priestly extraction, 186, 433; a disciple of the Baptist, 244; first coming to Christ, 244 sq.; his Gospel, 144 sq.; value as regards the chronological order of events of Christ's life, 150, 153; records history of first period of Christ's work, 242; near the Cross, vii. 47; his account of the Resurrection, 47, 50, 68 sq.; his life and work, viii. 153 sq.; his Gospel, 164 sq.; his Epistles, 167 sq.; his writings in the Canon, 352 sq., 355 sq.
John the Baptist, his origin and fundamental thought, vi. 160–67; his mode of carrying out his thought, 167–72; his meeting with Christ, 172–78; his end, 197 sq.; his later opinion of Christ, 327 sq.; his disciples, 172, 200, 327 sq., viii. 119 sq.
John, the Essene, vii. 530
John, the presbyter, author of the Apocalypse, vii. 527, viii. 156
Joktan, i. 286
Jonadab, nephew of David, iii. 170, 172
Jonadab, son of Rechab, founder of the association of the Rechabites, iv. 79 sq.; associated with Jehu in the extermination of the Baal-worship in Samaria, 100
Jonah, book of, iv. 123 *note* 3, 128 *note* 5
Jonah-place, the present Khan-Jûnus on the Phœnician coast, iv. 123 *note* 3
Jonah, son of Amittai, a prophet, iv. 123; wide range of his labours, 128, 196 *note* 2; his grave, 128
Jonah, the 'sign' of, vi. 348
Jonathan, a Sadducee, under John Hyrcanus, v. 383
Jonathan, brother of Judas Maccabæus, campaign on the east of the Jordan, v. 314; after the death of Judas retires into the wilderness of Tekoa, 324; crosses the Jordan, *ibid.*; and on his return defeats Bacchides, 325; besieged in Beth-basi, and cuts his way through, 326; makes peace with Bacchides, 326 sq.; concessions of Demetrius to, 327; occupies the temple mountain, *ibid.*; made high-priest by Alexander Balas, *ibid.*; his victory over Apollonius, 329; besieges the citadel at Jerusalem, 330; is confirmed in his position by Demetrius II., *ibid.*; subdues the country as far as Damascus for Antiochus the younger, 331; his victory at Hazor, *ibid.*; despatches ambassadors to Rome and Sparta, 332; defeats the generals of Demetrius and occupies Damascus, *ibid.*; meets Tryphon at Beth-shean, 333; made prisoner at Ptolemais, *ibid.*; executed at Tryphon, 334; reference to, in the book of Enoch, 347 *note* 2
Jonathan, eldest son of Saul, iii. 30; called the 'Gazelle,' 30; slays the Philistine officer in Gibeah, 30; attacks the Philistine camp, 34; his age at the commencement of Saul's reign, 52; divines David's future greatness, 66; friendship for David, 76; secures David's escape, 78–81; parts from David in the wilderness of Ziph, 92; falls in the battle on Mount Gilboa, 106; fate of his body, 110; buried at Zelah by David, 137
Jonathan, or Jannâi, son of John Hyrcanus, v. 386. See *Alexander Jannæus*

Jonathan, son of Abiathar, a priest, conveys tidings to David of Absalom's movements, iii. 183; joins the conspiracy of Adonijah, 211
Jonathan, son of Shimeah, nephew of David, slays a giant of Gath, iii. 148
Joppa, or Japho, seaport, ii. 90, 329, iii. 221, 235, 263; Jewish infantry conveyed to Egypt by sea from, iv. 219; timber transported to, v. 102; occupied by Jonathan, 329; Ptolemy Philomêtor at, 330; occupied by Simon, 332, 333; made a free port, 336; subdued by John Hyrcanus, 350; threatened by Antiochus Grypus, 364; starting point of the intrenchment of Alexander Jannæus, 391; loss of, 401; conceded to the high-priest by Cæsar, 406; conquered by Herod, 413
Joram, brother of Tibni, iv. 37
Joram, king of Judah, his place of burial, iii. 273 *note* 2
Jordan, river, i. 245; Joshua's passage of the, ii. 246 sq., 260; iii. 110; districts on the east loyal to Saul's house, 112; David crosses it on his flight from Jerusalem, 184; on his return, 190; commercial roads past, 261; the sons of the prophets settled on, iv. 80; Elijah crosses, before his ascension, 110
Jordan, valley of the, i. 245
Joseph, a designation of the northern kingdom, iv. 5
Joseph, an officer of Judas Maccabæus, defeated near Jabneh, v. 315
Joseph, brother of Herod, left by him at Masâda, v. 412; defeated near Jericho and slain, 415
Joseph, error for Johanan, one of the brothers of Judas Maccabæus, v. 334 *note* 3
Joseph, father of Jesus, lived at Nazareth, vi. 179; died many years before Jesus came to Baptist, 180
Joseph, husband of Salômê, put to death by Herod, v. 425
Joseph of Arimathea, member of Sanhedrîn, and secretly friend of Jesus, vi. 447
Joseph, son of Gorion, commander of Jerusalem, vii. 529
Joseph, son of Tobias, story of, v. 271
Joseph, the Patriarch, i. 374, 405 sq., 407–21; as the first-born of Israel, 422; ii. 3 sqq.
Joseph, tribe, i. 416 sqq., ii. 276–81
Josephus, Flavius, as chronologist, ii. 371; his account of the liberation of the Israelites by Cyrus, v. 48; his narrative of the building of the Samaritan temple, 213 sqq.; deficiencies of his history during the period after the conquests of Alexander, 225; his account of the three sects of the Judeans, 276 *note* 1, 365 *note* 2; narrative of the rule of John Hyrcanus, 343 *note* 1; authorities for his history of Herod's reign, 462 *note* 3; his attitude towards the Messianic hope, vi. 99; as a source for the life of Christ, 138 sq.; his History of the Jewish War, vii. 492 sq.; his early life, 531 sq.; governor of Galilee, 533; adviser and assistant of Vespasian, 573; in the camp of Titus, 578; seeks to persuade his countrymen to surrender, 595; his superstition, 605; intercedes for some of his people, 610; his life in Rome, viii. 17 sq., 67; account of his works, 68–75; on the Canon of the Old Testament, 337 sq. 346, 361
Josephus, or Josippon, ben Gorion, v. 71; nature and date of his history, 72, 128 *note* 3, 287 *note* 3, 323 *note* 4
Joses, one of the 'Seventy,' vii. 131; not identical with Barnabas, *ibid. note*
Joshebah, sister of king Ahaziah, saves Joash, and brings him up, iv. 134
Joshua, book of, i. 63 sqq.; rejected by the Samaritans, v. 281 *note* 1; viii. 324; in the Canon, viii. 321, 328
Joshua, high-priest, colleague of Zerubbabel, v. 84, 86; addressed by Haggai, 109; referred to by Zechariah, 111
Joshua, house of, its relation to the high-priesthood, v. 122, 327 sq.
Joshua (Rabbi), Ben-Chananja, viii. 45
Joshua, Samaritan book of, ii. 267 sq.; v. 96 *note* 3; viii. 324
Joshua, son of Nun, his name, ii. 229 sqq., 236; his position and his victories, 235–54; as ruler, 258–68; his age, 254 sq., 370; his descendants, 321
Josiah, son of Amon, king of Judah, extends his dominion over Samaria, iv. 227; accession of, 230; discovery of the book of the law in his reign, 233; convenes a popular assembly and makes a new covenant, 234; celebrates the Passover, 239; marches against Necho, 242; falls in battle near Megiddo, 242; buried at Jerusalem, 242; Jeremiah's elegies upon him, 243; his violence, 243; condition of parties during his reign, 244 sq.; place of his burial, iii. 273 *note* 6
Josippon, Jewish reproduction of Josephus' history, vii. 494
Josua, son of Perachja, Rabbi, vi. 14; Talmudists make him teacher of the child Jesus in Egypt, 142
Jotapata, fortress of, vii. 543
Jotham, son of Uzziah, king of Judah, length of his reign, iv. 118; age at his father's death, 145; power of Judah

under him, 155; activity and prosperity of his reign, 166; his death, 167
Journals of the Kingdom. See *State-annals*
Jozachar, assassinates Joash, iv. 141
Juba, a Libyan king, marries Glaphyra, v. 458
Jubal, son of Lamech, i. 272
Jubilee, year of, as a chronological device, i. 209 sq.; observation of the, fell into disuse, v. 167
Jubilees, book of, i. 201 sq., ii. 226, v. 473, viii. 345
Juchasin, book of, a late work similar to the Aboths, vi. 13
Judah, kingdom of, under David, iii. 109 sqq; tribe of, its discontent, 176; holds aloof under Amasa after Absalom's death, 190, 192; position at the disruption of the kingdom, 311 sqq.; its extent, iv. 2; its nature and characteristics, 10 sqq.; alliance of, with Damascus, 24 *note* 5, 25; attacked by Baasha, 34, 52; peace with Israel under Omri, 38; early history of, under Rehoboam, 43 sqq.; invaded by Egyptian troops, 46; by Zerah, the Ethiopian, in the reign of Asa, 51; and by Baasha, 52; its prosperity under Jehoshaphat, 57 sqq.; formation of the Messianic hope in, 59 sqq.; decline of its power under Jehoram, 94 sq.; its convulsions on the murder of Jehoram, 101; history during the second period, 134 sqq.; condition of the people in, under Uzziah, 146 sq.; its power under Jotham, 155, 166; invaded by Pekah's troops, 160; its dangers under Ahaz, 167 sqq.; laid waste by Shalmaneser, 177; invasion of, by Sennacherib, 180 sq.; its deliverance, 183; development of art, philosophy, and literature in, 190 sqq.; history of, during the third period, 201 sqq.; the Messianic hope in, 201 sqq.; overrun by the Scythians, 230 sq.; its independence threatened by the Egyptians, 242; position of parties in, after the death of Josiah, 244 sq.; the Egyptian supremacy, 251 sqq.; the Chaldean supremacy, 259 sqq.; the fall of the kingdom, 265 sqq.; literature in its last age, 277 sqq.; general results, 287 sqq.
Judah, son of Perachja, Rabbi, vi. 14
Judah, tribe, i. 365–67, ii. 283–87, 316–20
Judas, an Essee, v. 373 *note* 5; his prediction about Antigonus, 386 *note* 4
Judas Iscariot, his name, vi. 303; his special office, 305; objects to waste of precious ointment, 389; the possibility of his treason, 407 sq.; his death, 409; present at Last Supper, 421; betrays Christ with a kiss, 427
Judas Kananites, Apostle, from the school of the Zealots, vi. 300, 304
Judas Maccabæus, third son of Mattathias, v. 308; defeats Apollonius, 309; and Serôn, *ibid.*; campaign against Gorgias, 310 sq.; captures the temple-mountain, and purifies the temple, 311; his operations against the Idumeans and Ammonites, 313; campaign on the east of the Jordan, 314; in the south of Judea, 315; nearly drives the Syrians out of Jerusalem, 317; obliged to give up the investment of the citadel, 318; defeats Nicanor at Capharsalama, 321; second victory at Beth-horon, 321; his relation to Rome, 322; defeat and death at Beer-Zâth, 323; history of his exploits in 2 Macc., 465 sqq.
Judas of James, Apostle, whose name is found in Luke in the place of Lebbæus, vi. 304
Judas, son of Hezekiah, the Galilean robber, heads a rising against Archelaus, v. 453
Judas, son of Simon, v. 339; imprisoned and executed by Ptolemais, v. 342, 343
Judas, son of Soriphai, a teacher of the law at Jerusalem, executed by Herod, v. 448
Judas, the Gaulonite, of Gamala, founder of the school of the Zealots of the Law, vi 48 sq.; the 'Assumption of Moses' the literary memorial of his movement, 55 sq.; his end, 60 sq.; one of his seven sons perhaps author of the 'Assumption of Moses,' 61; difference of the Baptist's movement from his, 163; his sons, vii. 415, 504, 614
Jude, his two grandsons before Domitian, viii. 188 sq.; epistle of, in the Canon, 140 sq., 353
Judeans, at court during the exile, v. 8; position of the, in the eastern countries, 131 sq.; application of the name, 199 *note* 3; deported to Hyrcania, 206; to Egypt, *ibid.*; dispersion of, by Alexander and Ptolemy I., 237; transported from Mesopotamia into Lydia and Phrygia, 238; dispersion of, 239 sq.; position and privileges in heathen cities, 237, 240 sqq.; alliances with foreign nations, 245; in Egypt their sufferings under Ptolemy Philopator, 283; narrative of, in 3 Macc., 469 sq.; at the courts of the Ptolemies and the Cæsars, 289 *note* 1; in Gilead, oppressed by Ammonites, and rescued by Judas Maccabæus, 313; in Galilee, 314; their devotion to commerce, 363; in Asia Minor and Greece, become Roman

citizens, 364; three sects of, according to Josephus, 276 *note* 1, 365 *note* 2; led as captives in Pompey's triumph, 401; under the Roman rule, vi. 36 sq.; in Palestine, 85 sq.; in other countries, 81 sq.; vii. 300; their last efforts after the destruction of Jerusalem, viii. 259 sq., their sanguinary risings, 271 sq.; with Bar-Kokheba as king, 276 sq. See *Parthia, Christians, Samaria*
Judges, book of, i. 133, 161–64; in the Canon, viii. 328
Judges, their origin and significance, 357–63; their age, 269–74; their number and order, 363–67; their chronology, 367–73
Judith, a young widow, who kills Holofernes, story of, v. 447
Judith, book of, artificial names in, v. 189 *note* 1; its date and composition, 345, 474 sqq.
Julia (Livia, or Julias, or Livias), subsequently called Tiberias, the town on Lake of Galilee built by Antipas, vi. 75
Julia (Livia), Empress, vi. 71, vii. 239 (see *Corrigenda*)
Julianus Antonius. See *Antoninus*
Julias, north of Dead Sea, vii. 553
Julias, town on north-east of Lake of Galilee, built by Philip on site of Bethsaida, vi. 72, vii. 541. See also *Julia*
Junias, one of the 'Seventy,' vii. 131
Justice, administration of, by the kings, iii. 173, 176, 177, 250, 251; arrangements of Jehoshaphat for the administration of, in Judah, iv. 54; growing perversion of, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, under Jeroboam II., 126
Justin Martyr, philosopher and martyr, viii. 83, 149, 303 sq.; on Canon of New Testament, 357 sq.
Justus, son of Pistus, opponent of Josephus, vii. 534, 541, viii. 74

KABBÂLA (Cabbala, Qabbala), the original elements of, v. 190; oral tradition of the teaching of men of the Great Synagogue, vi. 14; continuation of Philo's system, vii. 218; first meaning of word, viii. 42
Kabul. See *Chobolo*
Kadesh (Kedasa), on frontier of Tyre, ii. 193–95, 201 *note* 7, vii. 507, 551
Kadytis (in Herodot. ii. 159), a Syrian city, not Jerusalem, but probably Gaza, iv. 252 *note* 4
Kanatha, victory and reverse of Herodat, v. 426
Karaites, in the Middle Ages, viii. 41, 300

Karduchian mountains, residence of Izates there, vii. 404
Kari, the. See *Carians*
Karnâim, v. 313 *note* 7; captured by Judas Maccabæus, 314
Keilah, city of, besieged by the Philistines, iii. 89; occupied by David, 91
Ken. See *Kenites*
Kenath, town, ii. 294, 300
Kenedæus, relative of Monobazos, vii. 406
Kenites, the, i. 109 sq., 250 sq., ii. 44–46, 286; among the Amalekites, iii. 38; in the south of Judah, 86 *note* 3; attacked by David, 102; the, remnant of them dispersed in Israel, iv. 79
Kenizzites, i. 251 sq., ii. 286
Kethubim, meaning of name, viii. 338
Keturah, Abraham's concubine, i. 314–16
Kidrôn, the brook, east of Jerusalem, iii. 124; crossed by David in his flight, 180; supplied water for Jerusalem, 253 sq.; valley of, 254 *note* 5; the ashes of the phallus of the goddess of love thrown into it, iv. 50; heathen vessels and statue of Astarte burned beside, by Hilkiah, 238
King, his position with reference to the Theocracy, iii. 6; his sceptre, 6; his crown, 6; his unction, 6, 7; his title, 6; bound to obey the law, 7; David a true king of Jahveh, 201; prophetic view of the true king, 315
'King of Kings,' or 'Great King,' origin of the title, iv. 152
King, the Messiah, king of Israel, vi. 208 sq.; Christ's claim to be a, 373
Kingdom of God, Christ's idea of, vi. 201–10; possible extension without his death, 379 sq.
Kingdom of Israel, restoration of, viii. 278 sq. See *Israel*
Kingdom of Judah. See *Judah*
Kingdom of Rome, as opposed to Christianity, viii. 225 sq.
Kingdom of the Ten Tribes. See *Israel*
Kingdom of the world, viii. 223, 238
Kingdom, the, its origin and development in Israel, iii. 12, 13; under David 120 sqq.; military organisation of, 139 sqq.; under Solomon, 204 sqq.; administration of, 266 sqq.; its disruption, 308 sqq., iv. 300. See *Monarchy*
King's-right, not to be confounded with state-right, iii. 27 *note* 6
Kings, books of, vol. i. 133–68; the older or prophetic, vol. iii. 206, vol. iv. 59, 286; first book of, xiii., 247 *note* 1; xvii.–xix., 84 *note* 2, 103 *notes* 1, 2; xix. 4–8, 107 *note* 2; xix., 247 *note* 1; xxii. 19–22, vol. v. 184 *note* 1; second book of, i. 2–16, vol. iv. 111 *note* 3; ii. 1–18, 84 *note* 2, 103 *notes* 1, 2; ii., 247 *note* 1; xviii. 13–xx., 181 *note* 1;

xix. 20–34, 183 *note* 2; xxi. 11–15, 220 *note* 3
Kinisrîn, identified with Zobah by Jâqût, iii. 154 *note* 2
Kir-Haraseth, a fortress of Moab, besieged by Jehoram and his allies, iv. 89
Kirjath-jearim, removal of the ark from, iii. 126; Urijah of, a prophet, executed by Jehoiakim, iv. 253
Kirjath-sepher, town, i. 241, ii. 285
Kir, river, northern boundary of the Assyrian empire, iv. 150; deportation of the Damascenes to, 160
Kish, the father of Saul, iii. 18
Koheleth, book of (Ecclesiastes), iii. 252; its language, v. 182; and style, 188 sq.; its sceptical tendencies, 194; denounces discontent, 210; its dissatisfaction with the Persian supremacy, 202. See *Ecclesiastes*
Kommagênê, identified with Zobah by Eupolemus, iii. 154 *note* 2
Korah's insurrection, ii. 178 sq.
Kronos, i. 361 sq.

Laban, son of Bethuel, i. 346–48
Labynetus, king of Babylon, identical with Nabunid, v. 52 *note* 2
Lachish, in the south-west of Judah, Amaziah put to death at, iv. 142; introduction of the worship of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes at, 147; besieged by Sennacherib, 181; captured by the Chaldeans, 273
Lænas, Pompilius, drives Antiochus out of Egypt, v. 297 *note* 1, 303
Lamech, Forefather, i. 265–67
Lamentations, book of, iv. 243 *note* 1, v. 17; its composition and authorship, 18. See *Jeremiah*
Language, decline of, in the seventh century, iv. 250
Laodicea, Judeans in, v. 239
Latin names adopted in place of Hebrew, v. 269
Laver, the priests', iii. 243 sq.
Law, giving of the, at Sinai, ii. 101–108; instruction in the, provided by Jehoshaphat, iv. 54; the old and the new, harmonised in Deuteronomy, 222; book of, discovered in the temple in the reign of Josiah, 233; books of, similar to the Pentateuch, their condition before Josiah, 239 sq.; of Moses, position of, in the days of Josiah, and during the exile, v. 133 sq.; re-established by Ezra in Jerusalem, 135; anxiety to carry it out, 172; relation of the Sadducees to, 278 sq.; of the Pharisees, 367 sqq.; and of the Essees, 372 sqq.; its position in the later Greek age, 489; schools of, vi. 41, 87 sq.; never attended by Jesus, 189; Zealots of, see *Zealots*; the ancient, in the view of Paul and of the Pharasaic Christians, vii. 381 sq., 428 sq.; copy of, amongst spoils of the temple at Rome, 611; in the Rabbinical schools, viii. 40 sq.; burnt by Romans, 47 sq.; given by angels, 137
Laws, in their earliest form, ii. 158-69
Lazarus of Bethany, his family, vi. 367 sq.; John's representation of the raising of, 369 sq.; the anointing of Christ in his house, 391; the ill-will of the Hagiocracy towards, 392
Leah, wife of Jacob, i. 293, 371–77
Lebanon, 'House of the Forest of,' 249; used as an armoury, iii. 250 *note* 1
Lebanon, northern boundary of the area of the census, iii. 162; timber and stone brought from, for the temple, 230, 234 sq.; Solomon's estates on, 257; mining operations in, iv. 192; cedar wood ordered from, for the second temple, v. 101
Lebbæus, the Apostle, vi. 304
Lechi, victory of Shammah at, iii. 141
Leftef, perhaps at present Nettif, vii. 554
Legio, a fortress built by Herod, v. 430
Legislative spirit, i. 82 sqq.
Lemba, v. 391 *note* 6
Leontopolis, the temple at, 354 sqq., 468; its situation, v. 356
Lepers, ii. 80 sq.; Christ's cure of one, vi. 280
Leprosy, ii. 80 sq.; imitation of sacrifice for, vii. 496
Lèse-Majesty (*crimen læsæ majestatis*), ii. 161
Levi, i. 359 sq., 364 sq.
Levi, tribe of, i. 364 sq.; in Egypt, ii. 36; a priestly tribe, 141 sq., 262 sq. See *Levites*
Levi, publican, son of Alphæus, not an Apostle, his call, vi. 277, 288; makes a feast for Christ, *ibid.*; probably an elder brother of James the Less, 304
Levi, son of Alpheus, one of the 'Seventy,' vii. 131, viii. 104
Levites, as writers, i. 175–77; cities assigned to them, 308–10; their manners in the age of the Judges, 344–50; massacre of, at Nob, iii. 90; take part in the removal of the ark, 129; their reorganisation by David, 133 sq., 247, 318; their quarters in the temple, 241; further organisation by Solomon, 247 sq.; not included in the computation of the tribes at the disruption of the kingdom, iv. 2; treatment of, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, 14; congregate in the kingdom of Judah, 28, 44, 225; appointed by Jehoshaphat to assist in teaching religion and the laws, and in the administration of justice,

54; their part in the fall of Athaliah, according to the Chronicler, 135 *note* 5; their duties, 140; recommended to the sympathy of the people in Deuteronomy, 225; hereditary Levites, how punished for their participation in idolatrous rites, by Josiah, 239; the small number who returned, v. 84 sq.; take part in the erection of the second temple, 102; re-established when the temple service was reorganised, 113; join Ezra's expedition, 138; their place in the public services under Ezra, 146; more compactly organised by Nehemiah, 160
Levites, their rivalry of the Priests, vii. 481, 484; as Christians, 132
Levy, the king's right of, of troops, iii. 144, 293; of labour, 230, 293
Libertini, synagogue of, vii. 157
Libnah, a city of Judah, revolts in the reign of Jehoram, iv. 95; besieged by Sennacherib, 182
Libyan troops in the Egyptian army of invasion of Judah, iv. 46
Lights, feast of, origin of the, v. 312
Lion, the, the ensign of Judah, iii. 250
Literature in the age of the Judges, ii. 356; progress of, under Solomon, iii. 275 sqq.; in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes after the disruption of the kingdom, iv. 42 sq.; in the period of its decline, 194; in Judah, during the first period, 57 sqq.; in the second, 190 sqq.; prophetic, 195; poetic, 197; dramatic, 199; historical, 199 sqq.; in the last age of the monarchy, 277 sqq.; artificial arrangement of songs, 281 sq.; prophetic, 283 sq.; proverbs, 284; historical, 285; its outward form, and arts connected with it, 286; increased activity in, during the Persian age, v. 185 sqq.; in the Maccabean period, 287 *note* 3; development of, in the later Greek age, 461 sqq.; historical, vii. 34 sq.; epistolary, in the early church, 320 sq.; Christian, viii. 241-259. See *Historical Literature*
Livias. See *Julia*
Lo-debar, east of the Jordan, iii. 185
Logos and Logoi, in Philo's writings, vii. 209 sq.; in epistle to the Hebrews, 477; term applied to Christ by Apollos, 390; whether used by Paul, 298; meaning of, in John's writings, viii. 165 sq. See *Word of God*
Longinus, name of Roman centurion in *Gospel of Nicodemus*, vi. 441
Longinus, Roman tribune, vii. *513*, *594*
Lord's Day. See *Sunday*
Lord's Supper, origin and significance, vii. 118 sq., evil reports arising from its celebration at night, 399; in the Corinthian church, viii. 206
Lot, Abraham's nephew, i. 299, 313 sq.
Lot, use of the sacred, iii. 23, 34, 36
Luke, author of Acts of the Apostles, vii. 23 sq.; as companion of Paul, 28 sq., 442 sq.
Luke, Gospel of, chronology of, vi. 150 sq.; in the Canon, 355 sq.
Lukuas, Judean rebel, viii. 273
Lupus, Egyptian governor, prohibits use of Temple of Onias at outbreak of insurrection in 116 A.D., vii. 616; viii. 273
Lusius Quietus, Roman general, viii. 274
Luz, city, i. 304
Lycaonia, dialect of, vii. 349
Lydda, a Samaritan district attached to Judah, v. 228; restored to Judah by Cæsar, 406
Lydda, town of, in plain of Sharon, vii. 184 sq.; Quadratus there, 419; Cestius there, 512; subjugated by Vespasian, *553*
Lydia, Judeans in, v. 238
Lydian monarchy, its rise puts a stop to the ravages of the Cimmerians, iv. 229
Lyrics (hymns), Christian, viii. 357; Davidic, in Canon, 329 sq.
Lysanias, principality of, vii. 258, 420 *note* 7
Lysanias, son and successor of Ptolemæus, v. 411; put to death at the instigation of Cleopatra, 425; his family reinstated by Augustus, 436; ancestor of the Lysanias in Luke iii., 450 *note* 4
Lysias, appointed governor of Syria by Antiochus Epiphanes, v. 309; despatches troops for a second campaign against Judas Maccabæus, 311; has Antiochus Eupator crowned, on the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, 316; conducts a campaign against Judas Maccabæus, 317 sq.; makes peace with the Judeans, 318; puts Menelaus to death, and appoints Alcimus as high-priest, 319; is himself killed, 319
Lysias, situation of, v. 404 *note* 1
Lysimachus, Alexandrian, historian, and enemy of the Judeans, ii. 86, viii. 64
Lysimachus, executed by Herod, v. 429 *note* 1
Lysimachus, brother of Menelaus, attacks the people in Jerusalem, v. 295
Lystra, town of, Paul at, vii. 348

Maacah, place, ii. 302
Maachah, grand-daughter of Absalom, wife of Rehoboam, iv. 47, 50 *note* 1
Maachah, king of Gath, iii. 215 *note* 3

Maachah, kingdom of, iii. 153
Mabortha, site of subsequent Neapolis (Nabulus), viii. 83
Maccabees, the, v. 306 sqq.; meaning of the name, 309 *note* 1; referred to, in the book of Enoch, 347 *note* 2; the books of, 462 sqq., 471 *note* 2; first book of, 463 sq.; second book of, 162, 464 sqq.; third book of, 283, 468 sqq.; fourth book of, 484 sq., vii. 485; fifth or Arabic book of, v. 287 *note* 3, 323 *note* 4, 342 *note* 2; Canon of viii. 331 sq.
Macedonia, Judeans in, v. 239
Macedonians, in Babylon, v. 285
Machæras, an officer sent into Judea by Antony, v. 414 sq.
Machærus, castle of, built by Hyrcanus, v. 382; given up to the Pharisees, 394; on the east coast of the Jordan, 403; vi. 199; John's imprisonment there, 199; first visit in recent times to, by Seetzen, *ibid.*; recent visit by Tristram, 200; in Jewish War, vii. 572, 613
Machir, son of Ammiel of Lo-debar, shelters Meribosheth, iii. 135; assists David, 185
Machir, tribe, ii. 280
Madian. See *Midian*
Magdala, home of Mary Magdalene, vi. 253
Magdol, city of, iv. 242
Magdon for Megiddo, iv. 242 *note* 1
Magedan. See *Dalmanutha*
Magic and magicians, ii. 55, 63, iii. 44, 51, iv. 247, vii. 317 sq., 391 sq., viii. 20, 89 sq., 123 sq.
Magog, probably denotes Scythian tribes, iv. 229; designation of the Chaldean forces, 256
Mahalal-el, Forefather, i. 267
Mahanaim (*two camps*), place, i. 305, ii. 296; the seat of Ish-bosheth's government, iii. 112; David takes refuge in, 184; siege of, 185
Mahol, the sons of, famous for their wisdom, iii. 278
Maked, captured by Judas Maccabæus, v. 314
Malachi, the prophet, denounces the priests, v. 174; character of his ministry, 176; meaning of the name, 177 *note* 2; language of, 182; evidence afforded by his book of the prevailing spirit of inquiry, 194; denounces indifference, 200
Malatha, castle of Agrippa I. in Idumea, vii. 237
Malchus, Arab king, vii. 543
Malchus, author and prophet, viii. 62
Malchus, leader of the high-priest's guard, at the arrest of Christ, 427 sq.

Malchus, or Malich, successor of Aretas, refuses to aid Herod, v. 412; war of Herod with, 426; proposed flight of Alexandra to, 427
Malich, having been advanced by Antipater, murders him, v. 408; his own fate, *ibid.*
Malthacê, mother of Archelaus, v. 448
Mamilla, pool of, not identical with the Gihon, iii. 254 *note* 2; possibly the same as the Serpent's pool, 256 *note* 1
Man, Son of. See *Messiah*
Manaen (Manahem), distinguished Christian, vii. 338
Manahem, an Essee, v. 373 *note* 5; how treated by Herod, 438
Mananem, ephemeral Zealot king, son of Judas the Gaulonite, vii. 504 sq.
Manasseh, husband of Judith, v. 476 *note* 3
Manasseh, prayer of, in the Apocrypha, i. 186, iv. 218 *note* 1
Manasseh, son of Hezekiah, king of Judah, iv. 207; restores the heathen rites of Ahaz, 208; removes the altar from the forecourt of the temple, and the ark from the Holy of Holies, 209; carried captive to Babylon, 217; his repentance, 217 sq.; restores the altar, 218; prosperity of his later years, 219; his attempts to promote heathenism, 237; his violence, 243; length of his reign, 301 *note* 2; place of his burial, vii. 273
Manasseh, son of high-priest John, marries the daughter of Sanballat, v. 213; flees to Samaria, 214, 216
Manasseh, tribe, i. 382 sq., ii. 280 sq.; beyond the Jordan, 299 sq., 324
Manasseh, uncle of Eleazar, high-priest, v. 270
Manetho, the chronologist, i. 387 sq., ii. 76–85
Manna, ii. 221 sq.
Manners of the people in the age of the Judges, ii. 350–53; of Israel, under Solomon, iii. 271 sqq.
Manuscripts, preparation and circulation of, iv. 191; art of copying, 286
Maon, in Judah, David and his troops at, iii. 85, 93, 97
Maon, nation, i. 239 sq.
Maonites, or Minites, reduced by Uzziah, iv. 143
Mara, son of Serapion, his epistle to Serapion, viii. 22 sq.
Marah, place, ii. 99
Marches of Israel out of Egypt, ii. 67–76, 97–101, 185–201
Mardokempad, iv. 187. See *Merodach-Baladan*

MAR

Mareotis, lake, west of Alexandria, settlement of Therapeutæ near, v. 376
Mareshah, or Marissa, a city near Keilah, south of Eleutheropolis, iii. 89 *note* 4; the Ethiopian army at, iv. 50; defeat of priests at, by Gorgias, v. 315; subdued by John Hyrcanus, 350; inhabitants of, maltreated by the Samaritans, 353; Marissa perhaps the same as, 397 *note* 6; destroyed, 412
Marginal notes to an ancient document, i. 126
Mark, John, the Evangelist, previous history, vii. 336; companion of Paul and Barnabas, 337; deserts Paul, 344; Paul declines to take him second time, 363; partial martyr, 479; said to be first bishop of Alexandria, viii. 197
Mariamne, a tower at Jerusalem, erected by Herod, iii. 238, v. 435
Mariamne, daughter of Alexandra, v. 408; betrothed to Herod, *ibid.*; marriage with Herod at Samaria, 416; shut up in the Alexandreum, 427; executed, 428
Marion, despot of Tyre, v. 408
Marissa. See *Mareshah*
Marriage, with a husband's brother, provision for, in Deuteronomy, iv. 225; contention about, between Shammai and Hillel, vi. 34; quibbles of Pharisees about, with Jesus, 385 sq.
Marriages, mixed, opposition of Ezra to, v. 139; dissolved, 142 sq.; opposition of Nehemiah to, 160; prohibited by the covenant, 166
Marsus, Syrian governor, watches Agrippa I., vii. 265
Martyrologium, the earliest, vii. 163
Martyrs, the first Christian, vii. 163 sq., viii. 218 sq., 231 sq., 239; in Xystus's Proverbs, 249 sq. See *Persecutions*
Marullus, Roman governor, vii. 240
Mary, Church of St., on the temple mountain, iii. 232 *note* 5
Mary Magdalene, vi. 223, 253, 305
Mary, sister of Lazarus, vi. 305
Mary, the mother of Christ. See *Christ* and *Christ's Mother*
Mary, the mother of Clópas, vi. 305; the mother of Jose, 305
Mary, the mother of James the Less, vi. 305
Masâda, or Massada, fortress of, on the south-west of the Dead Sea, v. 382; flight of Herod to, 412; besieged by Antigonus, 413; relieved by Herod, *ibid.*; Herod shuts up his Idumean relations in, 427; refitted by Herod, 435; mentioned, vii. 572, 813
Masaloth, Syrian troops at, v. 323; its position, 323 *note* 4

MEG

Maspha, v. 313 *note* 7; captured by Judas Maccabæus, 314
Massêpha, or Mizpah, v. 310
Masôra, the, supposed origination of, by Ezra, v. 164; viii. 42
Mattan, high-priest of Baal at Jerusalem, slain on the accession of Joash, iv. 136
Mattaniah, younger son of Josiah, on his accession took the name of Zedekiah, iv. 265
Mattathias, a priest, of the family of Joarib, v. 306; retires to Môde'îm, 307; and flees into the wilderness, *ibid.*; his death, 308
Mattathias, name assumed by Antigonus with the high-priesthood, v. 412, 416. See *Antigonus*
Mattathias, son of Simon, imprisoned by Ptolemæus, v. 342 sq.; and murdered by him, 343
Matthew, the Apostle, vi. 303; his call related like that of Levi, *ibid.*
Matthias, high-priest, deposed by Herod, v. 448
Matthias, last high-priest, vii. 571; executed by Simon, 600
Matthias, son of Margaloth, a teacher of the law at Jerusalem, executed by Herod, v. 448, 450
Matthias, the Apostle, his election, vii. 143
Mazkîr, the, at Solomon's court, iii. 267, 270 *note* 11
Medad and Eldad, ii. 29
Mêdebâ, in Reuben, ii. 206; invested by the Ammonites, iii. 154; Johanan slain at, v. 324; captured by John Hyrcanus, 349; situation of, 325 *note* 1, 397 *note* 6
Medes, the, at the head of the eastern nations, attack Nineveh, iv. 227; their failure and rout, 228; designation employed by Æschylus and Aristophanes, v. 40 *note* 1. See *Persians*
Media, part of the Assyrian empire, iv. 150; deportation of Israelites to cities of, 165; made itself independent of Assyrian sway after the retreat of Sennacherib, 184
Mediterranean, the, Necho's fleet in, iv. 241; residence of Israelites on, v. 4; of Judeans, 239 sq.
Medo-Persians, their invasions of the southern countries, iv. 151
Megiddo, in the plain of Galilee, fortified by Solomon, iii. 259; Ahaziah dies at, iv. 98; battle near, between Josiah and Necho, 242
Megillath Antiochus, v. 287 *note* 3
Megillath Ta'anith, the, v. 381, 287 *note* 3; quoted, viii. 280 sq.

MEL

Melchi-shua, son of Saul, falls on Mount Gilboa, iii. 106
Melchizedek, king, i. 307–309
Melito, Christian apologist, viii. 304
Memphis, Israelites in, v. 3 *note* 1
Menahem, son of Gadi, becomes king of the Ten Tribes, iv. 154; length of his reign, 156; calls in the assistance of Pul, 150 *note* 6; and pays him tribute, 156; his death, 157; overthrow of his house in the reign of Pekahiah, 8 *note* 1, 157
Menander, founder of a Samaritan sect, viii. 91 sq.
Mendæans, viii. 127. See *Ssabians*
Menelaus, brother of Simon, one of the sons of Tobias, obtains the high-priesthood, v. 294; made prisoner, and then liberated, 296; maintains himself in Jerusalem, *ibid.*; put to death by Lysias, 319
Mephibosheth. See *Meribosheth*
Merab, eldest daughter of Saul, iii. 74; her five sons given up to the Gibeonites, 136 sqq.
Merbal, king of Tyre, iv. 300
Mercy Seat. See *Footstool*
Meribah, place, ii. 195
Meribosheth (*Mephibosheth*), Saul's grandson, ii. 389, iii. 119; receives his family estates from David, 135; remains in Jerusalem at the outbreak of Absalom's rebellion, 181; does homage to David, 191
Merj 'Ayûn, probably the ancient Ijon, iv. 34 *note* 3
Merodach-Baladan, king of Babylon, sends an embassy to Hezekiah, iv. 187
Mesene (Maishon). See *Spasinus Charax*
Mesha, king of Moab, revolts from Israel, iv. 77
Meshek, probably denotes the Scythian tribes, iv. 229
Messiah, the, growth of the expectation of his coming, iv. 19; causes contributing to its development, 59 sqq.; Isaiah's conception of, 202, 291; would belong to the house of David, 203; his advent not to be brought about by violence, 204; his origin limited by Micah to Bethlehem, 204 *note* 1; celestialisation of, vi. 107 sq.; his name 'Son of Man,' 113; 'Son of God,' 114; Logos, 117; Christ's adoption of name 'Son of Man,' 231. See *Anointed of Jahveh*
Messiahs, Pseudo. See *Christ*
Messianic hopes, origin of the, iii. 11, 202 sq.; in Deuteronomy, iv. 224, 292; powerfully reawakened under Josiah, 242; in the age of Zedekiah, 272; of the Judeans in Babylon, v. 67;

MIR

Cyrus regarded as the instrument of their accomplishment, 69; around Zerubbabel, 117; in Baruch, 27; in Ecclesiasticus, 263; in the days of Simon, 361; in the book of Enoch, 346 sq.; in the Wisdom of Solomon, 481, 484; the highest development of, vi. 103 sq.; of the Judeans at the end of the Apostolic Age, vii. 516 sq., 579; of the Christians, see *Parousia*; of Judeans at the close of their history, viii. 45 sq.
Methuselah, Forefather, i. 267
Mezâr Osha, tomb of Hosea, iv. 131 *note* 3
Micah, a prophet of Judah, iv. 172, 174; his view of the origin of the Messiah, 204 *note* 1
Micah, book of, iv. 177, 197; ch. vi. vii., 207 *note* 3, 219 *note* 7
Micaiah, son of Imlah, a prophet of Israel, iv. 76; predicts the defeat of Ahab, and Jehoshapbat, 76
Michaiah, daughter of Uriel of Gibeah, wife of Rehoboam, iv. 47 *note* 8; mother of Abijah, identified with Maachah (2 Chron. xiii. 2), 50 *note* 1. See *Maachah*
Michal, second daughter of Saul, iii. 73; married to David, 74; assists him to escape from Saul, 77; taken away from David, 99; restored to him, 111; her *contempt* for him, 127
Michmash, on the north of Jerusalem, Saul with his troops at, iii. 30; Philistine camp at, 31; war of, 33 sqq.; Jonathan settles at, v. 326
Middle-gate of Jerusalem, iv. 274
Middoth, Talmudic tract, descriptions of temple in, vii. 585, 587, viii. 40
Midian (also Madian) and Midianites, i. 315, 369 sq., 417, ii. 42–46, 181, 208, 334–36
Midian, on the Gulf of Elath, iii. 217
Migdol, Israelites in, v. 3 *note* 1
Milcom, altar to, built by Solomon, iii. 297
Miletus, Judeans in, v. 239
Millo, a fortification erected at Jerusalem by Solomon, iii. 258, 259 *note* 1
Mineans, i. 240
Minim, heretics or Christians, viii. 37
Mining operations in the Sinaitic peninsula, and in Lebanon, iv. 192
Minites. See *Maonites*
Minutius Felix, his descriptions of Christians, viii. 103; bold appeal to the rulers of the world, 304
Miriam (or Mariam), ii. 177 sq., 225; her position in Israel, iv. 134 *note* 3
Miracles in Egypt, ii. 61 sqq.; under Moses, 217–24; relation of, to religion, iv. 83 sq.

MIR

Miracles of Christ, his higher works, vi. 226–29; the motive of, 228 sq.; at Cana, 249 sq.; the draught of fishes, 276 sq.; healing a leper, 280; at Pool of Bethesda, 282 sq.; healing a palsied man, 286 sq.; a withered hand, 291 sq.; stilling the storm, 316; healing the demoniac of Gergesa, 317 sq.; restoring the daughter of Jairus, 320 sq.; curing the issue of blood, 320; raising the dead at Nain, 324; feeding the multitude. 336 sq.; walking on the sea, 339 sq.; cure of the woman's daughter near Tyre, 347 sq.; of a deaf and dumb man, 348; of a blind man, 349; of an epileptic boy, 354; of a man born blind, 364 sq.; raising of Lazarus, 368 sq.; cure of a blind man outside Jericho, 388; the miracles of John's Gospel, 369; in Acts of Apostles, vii. 32, 150 sq. See *Demons, Healing*

Mishna and Gemara, viii. 32, 36; Akiba's labours, foundation of, 263

Mishna, the, i. 201 sq., vi. 13

Mishneh, i.e. New Town, a part of Jerusalem, ii. 259

Mithra, worship of, among the Persians, v. 40 *note* 2

Mizpah, or Mizpeh, near Jerusalem, ii. 413, 427; Saul proclaimed king at, iii. 23; fortified by Asa, iv. 35; Gedaliah and Jeremiah at, 275; the faithful assemble at, v. 310

Mizpah (Mizpah of Gilead), town beyond the Jordan, i. 341, ii. 393; its situation, iv. 131 *note* 3; outrages at, 155

Moab, nation, i. 312 sq.; its history, ii. 199, 202–10, 333 sq.; Saul's wars with, iii. 43; relations with Israel, 87; repressed by Saul, 149; relations with Ish-bosheth, 150; conquest of by David, 150; remains faithful to David in Absalom's rebellion, 184; pays tribute to Solomon, 296; war of Jehoshaphat with, iv. 54 sq.; invaded by Jehoram and his allies, 88 sqq.; subsequently independent, 90; reconquered by Jeroboam II., 124; oracle on (Isaiah xv. xvi.), 145 *note* 1, 194

Moabites, the, subject to the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 4, 24; revolt after the death of Ahab, in the reign of Ahaziah, 24, 56, 77; plunder Israel in the reign of Jehoahaz, 121; pay tribute to Uzziah, 144; revolt from Judah under Manasseh, 214; toleration of, not enjoined by Deuteronomy, 223; attempt of Josiah to subdue them, 241; take part with Nabuchodrozzor against Judah, 262; oppressed by the Chaldeans, seek help from Judah, 268; subside in the advance of the Chaldeans, 271; war with the Chaldeans, 277

MOS

Mochraqah, place of Elijah's sacrifice on Carmel, iv. 106 *note* 1

Mockers, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 115; in Judah, 147, 210

Môde'îm, a town west of Jerusalem, v. 307; monument erected in, by Simon, 337

Molech, not to be identified with Milcom, iii. 297 *note* 3

Moloch, sacrifices of, tolerated and performed by Ahaz, iv. 169; and by Manasseh, 209

Molon, Apollonius, author, viii. 64

Molon, governor under Antiochus the Great, v. 285

Monarchy, ii. 149 sq., 361, 427, 430; its defects, iii. 8 sqq.; its foundation under Saul, 15 sqq., 25, 36, 46; its consolidation under David, 120 sqq.; its military organisation, 139 sqq.; its relations with the priesthood, 200, 267 sq., 297; its splendour under Solomon, 204 sqq.; its administration, 266 sqq.; relations to prophetism, 298 sq.; established in Israel, 307; its disruption, 308 sqq.; in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes really elective, iv. 8; how affected by the revolution of Jehu, 114 sqq.; its relations with the prophetic power, 5, 9, 70, 119, 129; in Judah, 15; its relations with the priesthood under Joash, 140; and under Uzziah, 145; after the death of Josiah, in the hands of the heathen party, 245 sqq.; its general results, 287 sqq.

Monobazos, king of Adiabene, convert to Judeanism, vii. 404 sq.

Mons Scandali, origin of the name, iii. 297 *note* 3

Monuments of ancient history, i. 20 sq.

Morals, dissolution of, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, under Jeroboam II., iv. 126 sq.; decline of, in Judah, under Uzziah, 146 sqq.

Mordecai, a Chaldean name, v. 33 *note* 2; a Medo-Persian name, 230 *note* 3 (see book of Esther)

Moreh, Canaanite proper name, connected with Moriah, iii. 230 *note* 4

Moresheth Gath, the ark detained there three months, iii. 127; not to be confounded with Mareshah, iv. 50 *note* 4

Moriah, Mount, north-east of Zion, the site of the temple, iii. 230; cause of its sanctity, 231

Mosaic age, its elevation and its relapses, ii. 169–85; ideas on its grandeur, 216–28

Mosaic sanctuary, its fortunes, ii. 413–18

Moses, whether he invented writing, i. 50; his flight into Asia and return, ii. 35 sq.; beginning of his history, 41–46; as prophet, 47–57, 224 sq.; his age, 46, 211; his name, 82, 226; close of his life. 211 sq.; his death, 224; his staff, 19, 61, 221, 223; Book of the Death of Moses (*Petîrath Moshe*), 226; Elijah subsequently ranked with, iv. 113; use of his name and personality in Deuteronomy, 221 sqq.; the 'Ascension of,' v. 74 *note* 3, 367 *note* 5, 479; a second expected, vi. 106; Book of the Assumption of, 51–61; the Messiah therein called the messenger of God, 111

Mosque El-Aqṣâ, on the temple mountain, iii. 232 *note* 6

Mosque El-Sachrâ, position of, iii. 233, *note* 1

Mount Seir, inhabitants of, invade Judah in the reign of Jehoshaphat, iv. 54 sq.

Mountain, the, near Capernaum, to which Christ resorted, vi. 297

Mourning, annual days of, v. 22, 114

Muratorian Fragment on Canon of N. T., nature of, viii. 359; reference to Theophilus there, vii. 33; and to Hermas, viii. 236; as to Canon, 347

Music, of the Prophets, ii. 424 sq.; David's skill in, iii. 60, 67; the Gittite, 101; in the temple services, 248; development of, in Solomon's time, 283; influence of Greek, v. 267

Mysteries, Judean, references to in Philo, vii. 224; communicated only to the initiated among the Elcesaites, viii. 124

NAAMAH, mother of king Rehoboam, iii. 312

Naaman, an Aramean general, cured by Elisha of his leprosy, iv. 86, 93 *note* 1

Nabal, his residence at Maon, iii. 97; insults David's messengers, 98; dies, 99

Nabateans, i. 314–16; the foundation of their power, v. 153; east of the Jordan, 314, 324; the extent of their rule, 351; Itureans contrasted with, 386; a certain Nabateus belonging to, vii. 598; their kingdom made a Roman province, viii. 275

Nablûs, on the site of the ancient Shechem, iv. 23. See *Sichem*

Nabonassar, king of Babylon, iv. 298

Nabopolassar, general of Sarak, sent to protect Babylon against the Scythians, iv. 255; became the founder of a new Chaldean power, 256; alliance with Cyaxares, 256; his death, 258; length of his reign, 298 *note* 2

Naboth of Jezreel, refuses to part with his vineyard, iv. 74; executed on a charge of high treason, 75; Ahab's crime against, 71, 107 *note* 1

Nabuchodrozzor (Nebuchadnezzar), son of Nabopolassar, married to the granddaughter of Cyaxares, iv. 256; defeats Necho at Carchemish, 257 sq.; recalled to Babylon on the death of Nabopolassar, 258; invades Syria, 259; his position among contemporary monarchs, 259; subjugates northern Syria, and invades Judah, 262; besieges Jerusalem, 264; carries Jehoiachim into exile, 264; war with the Ammonites, 268; executes the false prophets, 270; besieges Tyre, 270, 300; advances against Judah, 271; invests Jerusalem, 271; carries Zedekiah away into exile, 274; his treatment of Israel, v. 2, 81, 89; account of his madness in Daniel, 2 *note* 2; his death, 18; becomes the type of an oppressor in the book of Judith, 475

Nabunid, or Belshazzar, the last king of Babylon, v. 52; called Labynetus, 52 *note* 2

Nadab, son of Jeroboam I., becomes king of the Ten Tribes, iv. 32; besieges Gibbethon, 32; is slain by Baasha, 32; the last of his house, 8 *note* 1

Nahal-Arabim, the southern boundary of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 4 *note* 1

Nahardea, centre of Judeans in Babylonia, vii. 522 sq.

Nahash, husband of Zeruiah, iii. 87 *note* 6

Nahash, king of Ammon, besieges Jabesh Gilead, iii. 24; death of, 151; succeeded by Hanun, 151

Nahash of Rabbah, an Ammonite, iii. 185

Nahor and Nahoreans, i. 268 sq., 310 sq., 369

Nahum, a prophet among the exiles of the Ten Tribes, his residence in Elkosh, iv. 165; predicts the fall of Nineveh, 227 sq.; book of, iii. 8–10, 241 *note* 1; his style, 280; oracle of, 284; quoted, v. 93

Nain, or Main, in the extreme south of Palestine, vii. 569

Names, formation of proper, in *-jah*, iii. 168 *note* 1; artificial, in prophetic and fictitious writings, v. 189 *note* 1

Naphtali, tribe, ii. 290 sq., iii. 227; subdued by Baasha, iv. 34 *note* 3

Narbata, sixty furlongs from Cæsarea, vii. 496

Nasi, i.e., royal prince of Judah, a title applied to Zerubbabel, v. 87 *note* 7

Nasî, rabbinic title, vi. 14, 16, viii. 35; assumed by Bar-Kokheba, 283

Nathan, son of David, by Bath-sheba, iii. 165 *note* 4
Nathan, the prophet, forbids David to erect the temple, iii. 131 sqq.; rebukes David for his intrigue with Bath-sheba, 167; supports Solomon's claim, 209; relations with Solomon, 219, 300, 302; belonged to the priesthood, 302
Nathanael of Cana, his introduction to Jesus, vi. 247 sq.; probably same as Apostle Bartholomew, 393
Nature, cessation of works on, in the second period of the monarchy in Judah, iv. 200
Navigation of the Red Sea, iii. 263 sqq.
Nazaræans (see *Errata*), name interchanges at times with that of Essenes, viii. 146; class of Christians, distinguished from Ebionites, 152 sq.
Nazareth, the home of the family of Jesus in his youth, vi. 179; probably left shortly before his baptism, 180; his rejection at, 321 sq.
Nazirite, James, the Lord's Brother, a, vii. 169
Nazirite (not *Nazarite*), ii. 396 *note* 1
Nazirites, ii. 396–99, 408; in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 79; at Mizpah, v. 310; compared with the Essees, 371, 373; the Baptist's similarity to, vi. 168
Nebat, father of Jeroboam, iii. 304
Nebo, probably intended as the place of Elijah's end, iv. 111 *note* 1
Nebuchadnezzar. See *Nabuchodrozzor*
Nebuzaradan, commander of the royal body-guard, carries out the destruction of Jerusalem, iv. 274; his treatment of Jeremiah, 275
Necho, son of Psammetichus, king of Egypt, iv. 241; his preparations for a campaign against the Assyrians, 241; defeats Josiah near Megiddo, 242; entices Jehoahaz to Riblah, and sends him prisoner to Egypt, 252; treats Judah as a conquered country, and places Eliakim on the throne, 252; occupies Carchemish, 257; defeated by Nabuchodrozzor, 258; his retreat and capture of Gaza, 258
Necromancy, art of, introduced from Egypt, iii. 50; tolerated by Ahaz, iv. 169
Nectanebus, king of Egypt, alliance of Judeans with, v. 206
Nehemiah, his memoir, i. 170, 193 sq.; his resemblance to Ezra, v. 147; cupbearer to Artaxerxes I., 148; his behaviour on hearing of the ruinous condition of Jerusalem, 149; obtains leave to rebuild the city walls, 150; arrival at Jerusalem, *ibid.*; difficulties in his way, 151 sqq.; not to be intimidated

154; organises the defence of Jerusalem, 155 sq; invited to conference at Ono, 156; his life aimed at, 157; distributes the work of rebuilding, and takes part in the consecration of the walls, 158; his rigorous administration, 159; revisits the Persian court, 160; returns to Jerusalem, *ibid.*; later representations of, 161 sqq.; legend of his recovering the holy fire, 162; rendered Ezra aid in establishing the covenant, 167
Nehemiah and Ezra, books of, i. 169, 188–95
Nehemiah, book of, vol. i. 169, 193 sq., 196; purity of its language, vol. v. 182; personal memoirs, 190; iii. 1–32, 82 *note* 3, 86 *note* 4, 151 *note* 4, 158 *notes* 1–5; iv. 5–9, 155 *note* 3; vii. 82 *note* 3, 100 *note* 6; viii.–x., 147 *notes* 1–3, 161 *notes* 2 sq., 165 *note* 1; xi. 3–xii. 26, 159 *note* 2; xi. 25–35, 82 *note* 3; xii. 27–43, 158 *note* 7; Canon of, vol. viii. 325 sq.
Ner, uncle of Saul, iii. 18 *note* 1, 22 *note* 4
Neriglissor, king of Babylon, v. 52 *note* 1
Nero, his awe of everything Oriental, vii. 408; his persecution of the Christians, 466 sq.; the legend of his return, viii. 79
Neronias. See *Cæsarea Philippi*
Nerva, his treatment of Christians, viii. 229; and Judeans, 260 sq.
Nessibin (Nisibis), identified by the early Christians with Zobah, iii. 152
Nestorians, their Canon, viii. 364
Nethaniah, father of Ishmael, iv. 276
New Hebrew, better name for Mishna Hebrew, vi. 21
New Testament. See *Canon*
Nezib, east of Eleutheropolis, iii. 89 *note* 4
Nicanor, a Syrian general, his campaign against Judas Maccabæus, v. 310; sent by Demetrius against Jerusalem, 321; is defeated at Capharsalama, and falls at Beth-horon, 321; gate of the temple called by his name, 322 *note* 1
Nicarchus, author, viii. 64. (See *Errata*)
Nicaso, daughter of Sanballat, v. 213
Nicodemus, the Pharisee, his coming to Jesus by night, vi. 260 sq.; his friend in the Sanhedrin, 375, 401. See also *Bunni*. *Gospel of Nicodemus* treats of events of crucifixion most fully, 444
Nicolaus and the Nicolaitanes, viii. 134 sq.
Nicolaus of Damascus, a historian, v. 395, 471; secretary of Herod, 417; sent to Rome by him, 443; convicts

Antipater, 447; intrigues for Archelaus in Rome, 451; his attitude towards the Judeans, 458; and towards heathenism, 459
Nimshi, grandfather of Jehu, iv. 96
Nineveh, Aramean language spoken around, iv. 149; its foundation and construction due to Babylon, 153 *note* 3, 253; attacked by Medes under Phraortes, 227; besieged by Cyaxares, 228; prolongation of its existence during the Scythian ascendancy, 229 sq.; conquest of, by the Medes and Chaldeans, 253; Chaldean settlement in, 254; its fall before the attacks of the Medes and Babylonian Chaldeans, 257
Nisibis, contributions to the temple stored at, v. 131 *note* 4; Judean centre in Mesopotamia, vii. 523
Noadiah, a prophetess, bribed against Nehemiah, v. 157
Noah, i. 269 sqq.
No-Amon, i.e. Thebes, destruction of, by Carthage, iv. 241 *note* 1
Nob, town, ii. 310 *note*; David's visit to, iii. 82; massacre of the priests at, 91
Nobah, town, ii. 300
Nobility, origin of a hereditary order of, iii. 42
Nobles, the, or free men, v. 87
Northern kingdom. See *Israel*
Numbers, mystic meanings of, in Philo, vii. 207, 210 sq.; sacred and mysterious, in Rabbinic schools, viii. 43; in fourth of Ezra, 51; in system of Simon Magus, 86 sq.; in system of Elcharaih, 123 sq.; in second of Peter, 182; in 'Shepherd of Hermas,' 237 sq.; in the Testament of XII. Patri, 255
Numenius, son of Antiochus, sent by Jonathan as ambassador to Rome, v. 332; despatched again to Rome by Simon, 336

Oaths, avoidance of, in epistle of James, vii. 452; of the Judeans, objections against, in Apion, viii. 66
Obadiah, house-steward of Ahab, iv. 66; required by Elijah to announce his coming to Ahab, 106
Obadiah, prophet of Judah, under Ahaz, iv. 159 sq.; book of, 271 *note* 2; inserted passages from older works in his prophetic book, 280; a fragment of an oracle of, reproduced by a later prophet, v. 15
Obedas, or Obodas, an Arabian king, defeats Alexander Jannæus, v. 389; 442
Obed-Edom receives the ark into his house, iii. 126
Oblias, surname of James, the Lord's Brother, vii. 170 sq.
Ochus. See *Artaxerxes III.*
Octateuch, of Mosaic writings, viii. 328
Octavian, favours Herod at Rome, v. 413; his war with Antony, 425; his recognition of Herod, 427. See *Augustus*
Oded, father of Azariah, iv. 49
Oded, prophet of the Ten Tribes, intercedes for the captive Judahites, iv. 160
Og, king of Bashan, i. 228–30, 295, ii. 207
Oil, used by Jesus in some of his cures, vi. 224; restorative means in early church, vii. 452; one of seven sacred things amongst the Elcesaites, viii. 123
Old Testament, feelings to which it owed its formation, v. 280. See *Canon*
Olives, Mount of, east of Zion, iii. 180, 231, 297
Olympus, chamberlain of Herod, v. 443
Omens, use of, iii. 16, 21, 28, 34, 39, 126; from the rustling of leaves, 147 *note* 5; in answer to prayer, iv. 186; evil, vii. 516, 564
Omri, commander-in-chief of the army of the Ten Tribes, proclaimed king by the troops, iv. 36; besieges Zimri in Tirzah, 36; becomes sole king, 37; after six years, removes the capital to Samaria, 37; length of his reign, 37; makes peace with Damascus, 38; promotes trade, 39; his 'statutes,' 39
Onias I., high-priest, son of Jaddûa, v. 270; Hebrew form of the name, 271 *note* 4
Onias II., high-priest, son of Simon I., v. 270
Onias III., high-priest, son of Simon II., v. 274; resists the efforts of Simon, son of Tobias, to crush him, 292; is assassinated, 295, 355; called the 'prince of the league' [A.V. 'covenant'], 296 *note* 2
Onias, son of Onias III., takes refuge in Egypt, v. 355; obtains permission to build the temple at Leontopolis, 356; resists Ptolemy Physcon, 357; final fate of his house, 358; his position in Egypt, 383
Onias, of Jerusalem, famous for his magical powers, his fate, v. 398
Onias, temple of, vii. 616
Oniôn, the town and district of the temple at Leontopolis, v. 356
Ono, west of Jerusalem, Nehemiah invited to a conference at, v. 156
Ophel, or Ophla, hill in Jerusalem, site of Solomon's palace on, iii. 249, 254 *note* 5; mentioned, vii. 582
Ophir, its situation, iii. 264; Jehoshaphat's voyages to, iv. 56

OPH

Ophrah, band of Philistine marauders at, iii. 33
Oracle, ii. 347 sq.; divination by the, iii. 51, 82, 89, 91, 136; of the high-priest, fell into disuse, v. 171. See *Urim and Thummim*
Oriental Philosophy, influence of, v. 184 sq.; in the Wisdom of Solomon, 480 *note* 1. See *Chaldean Philosophy*
Origins, book of, iii. 163, 200 *note* 3, 205, 227 *note* 2, 229, 235 *note* 2, 241 *note* 5, 243 *note* 3, 246, 279, iv. 153 *note* 4, 286. See *Book of Origins*
Ormiza, a village, east of the Jordan, v. 426
Orna, or Araunah. iii. 163
Ornan, or Orna, iii. 163
Oronas, v. 391 *note* 6
Orontes, river, iii. 154, 156
Orphic poems, v. 261
Osnappar, king of Persia, iv. 216 *note* 1
Osorchon, second king of the twenty-second Egyptian dynasty, iv. 51
Othniel, judge, ii. 285 sq., 317 sq.

PACHA, an Assyrian title, applied to Zerubbabel, v. 87 *notes* 5, 7
Pachath-Moab, the governor of Moab, v. 86 *note* 4
Pacorus, a Parthian officer, v. 411
Pacorus, a Parthian prince, v. 410 sq.
Palace, the, in Jerusalem, destroyed by the Chaldeans, iv. 274 sq.
Palestine, i. 214–24; earliest inhabitants of, 224–32; origin of the name, v. 235 *note* 1
Palm-robe, v. 334
Palms, used as decoration in the temple, iii. 239; on the bases, 244; in the sacred grove, 245
Palmyra, or Tadmor, founded by Solomon, iii. 261
Paneas, fortress of, called Zobaiba by Abulfida, iii. 154 *note* 2; the ancient Dan, v. 236; subsequently Cæsarea-Philippi, *ibid. note* 4; Scopas defeated at, 284; temple near, built by Herod, 436; rebuilt by Philip, son of Herod, vi. 72; supposed statues of Christ at, 157
Papias, his reference to John the Presbyter, viii. 156
Pappus, sent by Antigonus against Machæras, v. 415
Papyron. See *Cupyrôn*
Parables. See *Teaching of Christ*
Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, vii. 86
Paradise, where it was, i. 281 sq.; description of, in the book of Genesis, its origin and date, iv. 169
Paraleipomena. See *Chronicles, Books of*
Paran, city of, iii. 217
Paran, desert of, ii. 189, iii. 97

PEK

Parousia, the presence of the glorified Christ, vii. 84; expected near the Holy City, 190 sq.; disappointment at delay of, 85, 382, 475; delayed, viii. 142, 170; expected to be in Holy Land, 147, 186
Parthia, Judeans of, their contributions to the temple, v. 131 *note* 4; under Trajan, viii. 272 sq.; subsequently, 295
Parthian Empire in first century of Christian era, vii. 517 sq.; Judeans there, 518 sq.; latter decline to help fellow-religionists against Rome, 579
Parthians, the, described in the book of Enoch, v. 347 *note* 2; advance of, 403; overrun Syria, 411
Pas-dammim, victory of Eleazar at, iii. 141
Passover, ii. 262; celebration of, by Hezekiah, iv. 189 sq.; by Josiah, 239. See *Feasts*
Patmos, legend of John's banishment to, viii. 170
Patriarchs, the first and the second group of ten, see *Forefathers*; the three great (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob), i. 288–362, ii. 37; historical character, i. 300 sqq.; their God, 317–23, 333–35, history of the, v. 473; Testaments of Twelve, viii. 251–56. See *Testaments*
Paul, his extraction and youth, vii. 276 sq.; whether he ever saw Christ in the flesh, 58, 278 sq.; his conversion, 281 sq.; his view of Christianity, 289 sq.; his personal vocation, 298 sq.; as an Apostle, 313 sq.; whether other Apostles to the heathen preceded him, 323 sq.; his greatness as a writer of epistles, 320 sq.; his labours previous to the Council at Jerusalem, 325 sq.; his action at it and immediately afterwards, 351 sq.; his second great missionary journey, 361 sq.; his altered position in his third journey, 381 sq.; the crisis of his history in determining to visit Jerusalem again, 427 sq.; his fortunes until his arrival at Rome, 432 sq.; his stay there, 445 sq.; his end and lasting greatness, 470 sq.; his doctrine of sin compared with that in fourth Ezra and Apocalypse of Baruch, viii. 60; exaggeration of his views by the Gnostics, 134, 139; rejected by the Elkesaites, 124; and by the Jewish Christians, 148 sq.; his epistles in the Canon, 351 sq.
Pekah, murders Pekahiah and becomes king of Israel, iv. 157; his alliance with the Arameans against Judah, 158, 170; length of his reign, 118, 161; his fall, 161
Pekahiah, son of Menahem, king of the

Ten Tribes, iv. 157; the last of his house, 8 *note* 1, 157
Peleg (Paleg), i. 268
Pelethites, soldiers of David's body-guard, iii. 143. See *Crete*
Pella, one of the cities of the Decapolis, on the east of the Jordan, v. 236; reduced by Alexander Jannæus, 391; Pompey marches through, 399; rising of Judeans at, vii. 507; flight of Christians to, 526
Pelusians. See *Sinim*
Pelusium, Sennacherib's army advances past, towards Egypt, iv. 180
Penance and repentance in the church, viii. 232 sq.
Penates, the ancient, in Israel, iv. 26 *note* 2
Peniel, or Penuel (Phanuel), city, east of Jordan, i. 304 sq.; temporary seat of government under Jeroboam I., iv. 23
Pentateuch and book of Joshua, i. 63–132
Pentateuch, the, neglect of, before the time of Josiah, iv. 234; the Samaritan, v. 217, 279, 281, viii. 323; in the Canon, 319 sq. See *Law*
Pentecost. See *Whitsunday*
People, the, their condition in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes during the first period iv. 41 sqq.; in Judah, during the first period, 57 sqq.; after the revolution of Jehu, 116 sq.; under Jeroboam II., 125 sqq.; in the reign of Uzziah, 147; under Hezekiah, 192
Peræa, left to Herod Antipas, v. 449
Perazim, Mount, identified with Baal-perazim, iii. 147 *notes* 1, 6
Perdiccas, restores Samaria, v. 227, 236
Perez-Uzzah, origin of the name, iii. 126
Pergamus, Judeans in, v. 239; the king of, seeks alliance with the Judeans, 245; its alliance sought by John Hyrcanus, 364
Peripatetics, among the Judeans, v. 257
Perizzites, nation, i. 236
Persecutions of the early church, vii. 164 sq.; in Jerusalem under Agrippa I., 269; under Claudius in year 52, 364; of Nero, 466 sq.; viii. 223 sq.
Persian drachmas, iii. 229; terms, introduced into Judea, v. 180; power, the, in Syria, overthrown, v. 214, 222
Persians, nature of their religion, v. 39 sq.; first occurrence of the name, 40 *note* 1
Peshito, viii. 348
Peter, Simon, Apostle, comes to Jesus, vi. 245 sq.; as Apostle, 301 sq.; meets Christ on the sea, 339 sq.; his confession, 350 sq.; at the washing of the disciples' feet, 415; his faith wavers at the end, 420; his relation to Simon Magus, vii. 181 sq.; baptises Cornelius, 185 sq.; his relations to Paul at the Council of Apostles, 356 sq.; at Antioch, 362 sq.; to the 'Christ' party, 383 sq.; the general course of his later years, 459 sq.; his epistle, 462 sq.; his martyrdom, 468 sq.; erroneously called first bishop of Rome and of Alexandria, viii. 197; and of Antioch, 216; 'the Apocalypse' of, 251; 'the Preaching' of, 182, 244
Peter, second of, viii. 180–83; in the Canon, 353
Petîrath Moshe, book, ii. 226
Petra (Sela), the chief city of Edom, captured by Amaziah, iv. 141; refortified by the Idumeans, 159; the seat of the Nabatean kings, v. 390, 412. See *Sela*
Petronius, Roman governor of Egypt, assists Herod during a famine, v. 432
Phalion, an Idumean of the time of Herod, v. 421 *note* 2
Phaltiel, husband of Michal, compelled to relinquish her, iii. 116
Pharan, valley of, vii. 569
Pharaoh, king, ii. 59 sq.
Pharisaic party in Christian church, vii. 351 sq., 381 sq., 449 sq.
Pharisees, the, v. 365 sqq.; their abuse of prayer, 24, 366; their degeneration towards the time of Christ, 367 *note* 5; their number, 368; their philosophical views, *ibid.*; meaning of the name, 369; promote the introduction of new annual feasts, 380 sq.; their love for John Hyrcanus, 382; subsequent hostility to him, 382 sqq.; their discontent with Alexander Jannæus, 388 sq.; their ascendency after his death, 392 sqq.; treatment of, by Herod, 438; fined by Herod for refusing to take the oath of allegiance to him, 445; the Rabbis, their successors, viii. 36 sq., 39 sq.
Pharos, the island of, v. 358
Phasael, eldest son of Antipater, v. 406; seeks the Parthians, 411; made prisoner, 411 sq.; kills himself, 412
Phasael, name of a mural tower built by Herod, iii. 238
Phasael, well of, not to be identified with the brook Cherith, iv. 105 *note* 1
Phasaêlis, a city erected by Herod near Jericho, v. 435; bequeathed by Herod to Salômê, 450
Phasaêlis, a tower at Jerusalem, v. 435; Sabinus takes refuge in, 452
Phelles, king of Tyre, displaced by Eth-baal, iv. 39
Pherôras, youngest brother of Herod, v. 414; put in charge of the kingdom by Herod, 427; laments Mariamne, 428; made tetrarch of Peræa, his suspicions of Alexander and Aristobulus, 439,

PHI

441; connection of his wife with the Pharisees, 445; his death, 446
Philadelphia, formerly Rabbath-Ammon, v. 236; Ptolemæus takes refuge in, 343; Herod's contest at, 426; mentioned, vii. 412, 507
Philip, the Apostle, his coming to Jesus, vi. 247 sq.; his characteristics, 302; appealed to by the Greeks, 403
Philip, the Evangelist, one of the Seven Deacons, vii. 178 sq.; baptises the Ethiopian eunuch, 183 sq.; at Cæsarea with his four daughters, 400; confounded with the Apostle, viii. 105
Philip, son of Herod by Cleopatra, v. 449; tetrarch of north-eastern provinces, 450; left in power by Archelaus, 451; taxes demanded by Augustus, 455; vi. 71–74; Christ's journey into his territory, 347
Philip, son of Jacin, military commander, vii. 503, 509
Philip, appointed by Antiochus Epiphanes guardian of his son, v. 316; seeks aid from Egypt, 317
Philippi, Paul at, vii. 368 sq.; church at, viii. 214
Philistines, i. 242–49; their language, 244 sq, 247; new kingdoms, ii. 338 sq., 415–18, 427–29; their disease, 415 sq.; severity of their oppression of Israel, iii. 33 sqq.; defeated by Saul and Jonathan in the war of Michmash, 34 sq.; Saul's wars with, 43; 200 of them slain by David and his men, 75; defeated by David, 89; their victory at Jezreel, 103; and at Mount Gilboa, 106; probably received tribute from David, 111; defeated by David at Baal-perazim, 147 sq.; support the revolt of Gezer, 218; pay tribute to Solomon, 296; position of their territories with respect to the two kingdoms after the disruption, iv. 4; besieged in Gibbethon by Nadab, 32; and under Elah, 35; probably freed themselves from the supremacy of Judah in the reign of Rehoboam, 46 sq.; tributary to Jehoshaphat, 57; attack Jerusalem in the reign of Jehoram, 94; call in the aid of Hazael against Judah, 137 sq.; subsequent alliance with the Arameans, 137 *note* 4; invade the kingdom of the Ten Tribes under Menahem, 155; regain their independence in the reign of Ahaz, 160; their inroads during his reign, 170; revolt from Judah, in the reign of Manasseh, 214, take part with the Chaldeans, against Judah, 271; their territory occupied by the Idumeans, v. 81; of Ashdod, their league with Sanballat and Tobiah, 155

PHR

Philo, author of an epic poem on Jerusalem, v. 260
Philo, Herennius, of Biblus, doubt whether he wrote concerning the Judeans, viii. 75
Philo, of Alexandria, on the life of Moses, ii. 225; his description of the Basket-feast, v. 358; and of the Therapeutæ, 375 sqq.; vagueness of his Messianic hope, vi. 99, 118; his family and early history, vii. 194 sq.; his love of philosophy and religion, 107 sq.; his language and style, 201; his studies and doctrinal system, 202 sq.; his position with regard to the Scriptures, 203; the sources of his philosophy, 209 sq.; the doctrines of his system, 211 sq.; his disastrous use of allegory, 219 sq.; the order of his works, 221 sq.; the Messianic element in his writings, 231 sq.; his weakness as apologist of his countrymen, viii. 96; in relation to Canon of the Old Testament, 339, 341
Philo, the Elder, writer on Judean history, viii. 62
Philosophy, or wisdom, its progress under Solomon, iii. 276 sqq.; power of, in the age of Manasseh, see *Wisdom*; influence of Oriental, v. 184 sq.; new Scholastic language of, 189; sceptical tendencies of, in the book of Koheleth, 193 sq.; influence of Greek, 256 sqq., 275; among the Samaritans, 279; among the Pharisees, 368; in the Wisdom of Solomon, 480; Rabbinic, viii. 31 sq.; of the Christian church, 114 sq.; Chaldean, 123, 125
Philostephanus, an officer of Ptolemy Lathûrus, v. 387
Philoteria, a city on the lake of Galilee, v. 236
Phineas, treasurer of the temple, vii. 611
Phinehas, Aaron's grandson, ii. 181, 313
Phinehas, Eli's son, ii. 412
Phinehas, Elijah identified with, in later times, iv. 113
Phœnicia, occupied by Ptolemy Lagi, v. 226; Judeans in, 239
Phœnician states, resemblance of the kingdom of Judah to, iv. 2 *note* 3; connexion formed with the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, 39, 40; their slave trade in captives from Judah, 138
Phœnicians, their tranquillity under Solomon, iii. 218; their skill as architects, 219; influence of their civilisation, 225; assist in the navigation of the Red Sea, 262 sq.; their skill in solving problems, 277; alliance of Judeans with, v. 206
Phocylides' poems, v. 261, vii. 307 sq., 311
Phraortes, king of the Medes, attacks

PHR

Nineveh, iv. 227; his failure and fall, 228
Phrygia, Judeans in, v. 238
Phylacteries, origin of, v. 367 *note* 3
Physicians, a profession distinct from the priests, vi. 221
Pilate, Pontius, Roman governor, characteristics, vi. 64 sq.; does not understand the Judeans, 65 sq.; his public works for Jerusalem, 67; proposes to put golden shields in royal castle at Jerusalem, 68 sq.; misunderstanding with Samaritans, 69 sq.; trial of Christ before, 429 sq.; in Rome, vii. 240; legend regarding, 274
'Pilgrim songs,' in the Psalter, v. 103
Pilgrimages, of Foreigners to Jerusalem, iii. 277; from the kingdom of the Ten Tribes to the Davidic sanctuary, iv. 25; to Jerusalem, number of persons making, vii. 579
Pillar of cloud and fire, ii. 217–20
Pillars, the, of the temple, iii. 237
Pious, the. See *Chasidees* and *Pharisees*
Pirqæ Aboth, earliest collection of sayings of the chief teachers of the Great Synagogue, vi. 13
Pitholaus, an officer of Aristobulus, v. 403, 408; put to death by Cassius, 403
Pithom, city, ii. 13
Plagues, ii. 60–62, 415 sq.; in David's reign, iii. 162 sq.; in Sennacherib's camp, iv. 183, 185
Platonic school, the, among the Judeans, v. 257; philosophy in Philo, vii. 201 sq., 213 sq.
Poetic literature in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 42 sq., 194 *note* 6; in Judah, 58, 197 sqq.; its artificial nature in the last age, 281 sqq.
Poetry, lyric, completely developed in David, iii. 59, 275
Politarchs of Thessalonica, vii. 372
Pollio, a Pharisee, teacher of Sameas, v. 413; honoured by Herod, 423
Pollion, Pharisee, vi. 16 sq.; probably identical with Hillel, 19
Polycarp, his life and his epistle to the Philippians, viii. 214 sq.
Polygamy of a judge, ii. 388; of David, its evil consequences, iii. 165; its influence on the administration of the kings, 272
Pompey, arrives at Damascus, v. 398; marches through Jericho and takes Jerusalem, 399 sq.; carries off the 'table of Solomon,' 400; his triumph, 401; his decrees revoked by Cæsar, 404
Pompey's Camp, vii. 599
Poppæa, wife of Nero, when raised to that position, vii. 240; 'religious' and

PRI

inclined to Judeanism, 408; Josephus introduced to her at Rome, 532
Popular freedom in Israel, ii. 315 sq.
Population of Judah in the reign of Jehoshaphat, iv. 56
Porch, the, of the temple, iii. 236
Posidonius, the Stoic, writer on Judean affairs, viii. 63
Prætorium, residence of the Roman governor in Jerusalem, vi. 39; Christ led into, 433
Prayer, power of, during the Captivity, v. 23; abuse of, in the age of the Pharisees, 24; in public worship, 145; practice of, among the Pharisees, 366; three times a day, vii. 126
Prerogative, the king's, iii. 41; of mercy, 214 sq.
Presbyters of the Christian church, distinguished from bishops, viii. 204, 207
Priest, the high, made supreme judge in ecclesiastical cases by Jehoshaphat, iv. 54
Priesthood, ii. 141–43, 178–80; hereditary, its connexion with the monarchy, iii. 133; its position under Solomon, 267, 299; its relations to the monarchy in Judah under Joash, iv. 140; under Uzziah, 145, 146; its corruptions under Manasseh, 210; and in the last age, 248 sq.; its position under the Hagiocracy, v. 203 sqq.
Priests, ii. 141–43, 178–80; massacre of, at Nob, iii. 90; their organisation under David, 125 sqq.; their position at the time of the removal of the ark, 129; their quarters in the temple, 238, 240; their forecourt, 243; their part in the dedication of the temple, 245; ordained by Jeroboam I., iv. 27 *note* 7, 28; their activity in the return from the Captivity, v. 84; their share in the erection of the second temple, 102; twenty-four divisions for the temple-service, 113; their immunity from taxes, obtained by Ezra, 136; assist Ezra in the public services, 146; their behaviour denounced by Malachi, 174; true priest sketched by Malachi, 174 *note* 3; in Jerusalem at time of Baptist, vi. 162; seek to persuade the people to make peace with Florus, vii. 497; as Zealots, 574 sq. See *Levites* and *High-priests*
Priests, of Baal, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 40; and of Astarte, 41; not to be confounded with the prophets of the two temples, 41 *note* 1; of heathen religions in Judah, put to death by Josiah, 238
Primitive history, book of, i. 61; third narrator of, 97 100; fourth, 100–6;

fifth, 106–15, iv. 62 *note* 2, 169; collection of books of, 22
'Prince of the Pious,' Simon called, in 1 Macc., v. 463
Princes, i.e. superior officers, iii. 270
Pronunciation, difference between the Hellenistic and that of the Masôra, v. 132 *note* 2
Proper names of ancient men and places, i. 16 sq., 20
Prophecy, its position during the exile, v. 35 sq.; causes of its extinction, 174 sqq.; fulfilment of Christian, viii. 183 sq.
Prophet, the great anonymous, vi. 106, 127; the expectation of a greater, 123–29; revival of prophetic spirit the third condition of the Messianic consummation, 126 sq.
Prophetic literature, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 194; in Judah, 195 sqq., 283; teaching, cessation of, during the captivity, v. 9 sq.; books, re-edited in the Persian age, 191; poetic compositions in the later Greek age, 473 sqq.; writings in the Canon, viii. 326
Prophetical treatment of history, i. 96 sqq., 119 sqq., 139 sq., 142 sq., ii. 28 sq.
Prophetism, development of, under Solomon, iii. 299 sqq.
Prophets: Moses, ii. 47–57; others, 139 sq., 359 sqq., 423–25; their music, 424 sq.; their schools, 424 sq.; position of, under the monarchy, iii. 6, 131, 162, 167 sqq., 219, 299 sqq., 310; their position and aims in the kingdom of Israel, iv. 5, 6, 9, 70, 119, 129; struggle with the crown under the house of Omri, 41, 65 sqq., 101 sqq.; tolerate the calf-worship, 65; schools of the, 80, 110; their position after the revolution of Jehu, 114 sqq.; commencement of the dissolution of prophetism under Jeroboam II., 126 sqq.; new order of, 129 sq.; use of the title Nabhî, 129 *note* 1; in Judah, 15, 49; new order of, 129; under Hezekiah, 173, 177 sqq.; persecution of, under Manasseh, 210 sqq.; their power regulated in Deuteronomy, 224; position of, after the fall of Josiah, 246 sqq.; in the last days of the kingdom, 267 sqq.; their relations to the monarchy, 288 sq.; during the second generation of the exiles, v. 41 sq., 46 sq.; assembled round the new sanctuary, 102; bribed against Nehemiah, 157; in Christian church, vii. 140 sq. See *Agabus* and *Philip*
'Prophets,' 'Saul among the,' iii. 50
Prophets of Baal, under Ahab, iv. 41 *note* 1, 65; contest of Elijah with, 106
Proselytes, of the first degree, v. 28 *note* 2; their importance in the history of Israel, 31; the desire to make them chiefly felt by Pharisees, vi. 85 sq.; classes of, and conditions of admission to privileges of Israel, vii. 310 sq.
Proseuchæ, iii. 210 *note* 1; established in heathen countries, v. 23, 243 *note* 1; 'house of prayer,' vii. 308; at Philippi, 368
Prototypes of the nation, i. 288 sqq.
Proverbs, i. 18, ii. 383 sq.; composition of, by Solomon, iii. 280; collections of, made by Hezekiah, iv. 198; the Solomonic, 220; composition of, 284 sq.; of Agur, 285
Proverbs, book of, vol. iii. 318; introduction to, vol. iv. 278, 283; i.–ix., 220 *note* 1, 232 *note* 1; xxviii. 3 sq., 15 sq., xxix. 4–19, 21, 126 *note* 2; xxxi. 10–31, vol. v. 189 *note* 2
Psalms of David, iii. 56, 134, 197
Psalms of Solomon, iii. 219, 281, 319 *note* 1. See *Solomon*
Psalms, Book of
i., vol. iv. 284 *note* 5, 285 *note* 3
ii., circumstances of its composition, vol. iii. 219; authorship of, 281
iii., iv., origin and composition of, vol. iii. 185, 197 *note* 1
v., vol. iv. 284 *note* 5
vi., vol. iv. 58 *note* 2, 198 *note* 8
x. 1–11, vol. iv. 207 *note* 3, 211 *note* 11
xii., vol. iv. 147 *note* 3, 198 *note* 2
xiii., vol. iv. 58 *note* 2, 198 *note* 8
xiv. (liii.), vol. v. 7 *note* 3, 42, 103 *note* 2
xv., vol. iv. 198 *note* 8
xvi., vol. iv. 213 *notes* 1 and 3, 281, 284 *note* 5
xvii., vol. iv. 211 *note* 1, 284 *note* 5
xviii., composition of, vol. iii. 159, 164
xx., vol. iv. 50 *note* 3, 58, 198 *note* 8
xxi., vol. iv. 9 *note* 1, 198 *note* 8, 284 *notes* 3 and 5
xxii., vol. iv. 213 *note* 3, 279, 284 *note* 5
xxiii., vol. iv. 58, 198 *note* 8, vol. v. 187 *note* 2
xxiv., composition of, vol. iii. 128
xxv., vol. iv. 282 *note* 1, 285 *note* 3
xxvi., vol. iv. 284 *note* 5
xxvii., vol. iv. 58 *note* 1, 198 *note* 8, 284 *note* 5, 293 *note* 1, vol. v. 187 *note* 2
xxviii., probably composed by king Josiah, vol. iii. 251 *note* 2, vol. iv. 233 *note* 2, 284 *note* 5
xxx., vol. iv. 58 *note* 2, 198 *note* 8, vol. v. 112 *note* 4
xxxi., vol. iv. 284 *note* 5
xxxii., origin and composition of, vol. iii. 167, 197 *note* 2
xxxiii., vol. v. 187 *note* 3

PSA

Psalms, Book of (*cont.*)
xxxiv., vol. iv. 282 *note* 1, 285 *note* 3
xxxv., vol. iv. 279, 284 *note* 5, vol. v. 188 *note* 2
xxxvi., vol. iv. 213 *note* 3, 284 *note* 5
xxxvii., vol. iv. 213 *note* 3
xxxviii., vol. iv. 279, 284 *note* 5
xxxix., vol. iv. 9 *note* 1, 197 *note* 1, 279
xli., vol. iv. 58 *note* 2, 198 *note* 8
xlii.–lxxxix., vol. iv. 284 *note* 5
xlii., xliii., vol. iv. 263 *note* 2, 270 *note* 1, 281 *note* 2, 284 *note* 2
xliv., vol. v. 120 *note* 1
xlv., vol. iv. 9 *note* 1, 124 *note* 1, 198 *notes* 4 and 9
xlvi., vol. iv. 186 *note* 1, 198 *notes* 3 and 9
xlvii., vol. v. 112 *note* 4, 173 *note* 2
xlviii., vol. iv. 186 *note* 1, 198 *note* 3
xlix., vol. iv. 213 *note* 1, 281 *note* 2, 285 *note* 3, 286
l., vol. iv. 240, 283 *note* 2
liii., vol. v. 7 *note* 3, 42, 103 *note* 2
lv., vol. iv. 211 *note* 1
lvi., vol. iv. 198 *note* 1, 279, 281 *note* 2, 284 *note* 2
lvi –lviii. vol. v. 16 *note* 4
lvii., vol. iv. 198 *note* 1, 279, 284 *note* 2
lviii., vol. iv. 279
lix., vol. iv, 186 *note* 2, 233, 279, 281 *note* 2
lx., composition of, vol. iii. 158, vol. v. 120 *note* 1
lxi , vol. iv. 213 *note* 3
lxii., vol. iv. 9 *note* 1, 198 *note* 1
lxv., vol. iv. 198 *note* 3
lxvi., lxvii., vol. v. 112 *note* 4, 187 *note* 3
lxviii., composition of, vol. iii. 128, vol. v. 98 *note* 1, 112 *note* 4
lxix., vol. iv. 279, 280 *note* 3, 281 *note* 2, vol. v. 16 *note* 3, 188 *note* 2
lxxi., vol. v. 16 *note* 3, 188 *note* 2
lxxii., vol. iv. 205 *note* 1, 284 *note* 3
lxxiii., vol. iv. 213 *note* 1, 279, 285 *note* 3, vol. v. 16 *note* 3
lxxiv., vol. v. 120 *note* 1, 188 *note* 3
lxxv., lxxvi., vol. iv. 185 *note* 1, 198 *note* 3
lxxvii., vol. v. 16 *note* 3, 98 *note* 1, 192 *note* 1
lxxviii., vol. v. 121 *note* 4, 191 *note* 6
lxxix., vol. v. 120 *note* 1, 188 *note* 3
lxxx., vol. v. 98 *note* 1, 120 *note* 1, 188 *note* 3
lxxxi., vol. v., 98 *note* 1, 187 *note* 3
lxxxii., vol. iv. 279, vol. v. 16 *note* 4
lxxxiii., vol. v. 148 *note* 3, 153 *note* 4, 155, 188 *note* 3
lxxxiv., vol. iv. 263 *note* 2, 270 *note* 1, 281, 284 *note* 2

PSA

Psalms, Book of (*cont.*)
lxxxv., vol. v. 120 *note* 1
lxxxvi., vol. v. 187 *note* 4
lxxxvii., vol. v. 103 *notes* 1 and 2, 188 *note* 4
lxxxix., vol. v. 119, 120 sqq.
xc., vol. iv. 9 *note* 1, 194 *note* 5
xc.–cl., vol. v. 187 *note* 3
xci., vol. v. 62 *note* 1, 114 *note* 4, 187 *note* 1
xciii , vol. v. 112 *notes* 4 and 5
xciv., vol. v. 16 *note* 3
xcv., vol. v. 112 *note* 4
xcvii., vol. v. 54 *note* 1
xcviii., vol. v. 54 *note* 2
xcix., vol. v. 191 *note* 6
ci., composition of, vol. iii. 128 sq.
cii., vol. v. 16 *note* 3, 188 *note* 2
ciii., civ., vol. v. 114 *note* 4
cv., vol. v. 191 *note* 6
cvi., vol. v. 173 *note* 1, 191 *note* 6
cvii., vol. v. 173 *note* 1
cviii., vol. v. 187 *note* 4
cix., vol. v. 188 *note* 2
cx., composition of, vol. iii. 158
cxi.–cxiv., vol. v. 173 *note* 1
cxi., cxii., vol. v. 188 *note* 1
cxv., vol. v. 101
cxvi., vol. v. 101, 182 *note* 2, 187 *note* 1
cxviii., vol. v. 101
cxix., vol. v. 172, 188 *note* 9, 189
cxx. sqq., vol. v. 188 *note* 4
cxx.–cxxxiv., vol. v. 103 *note* 2
cxxi., vol. v. 44 *note* 2
cxxiii., vol. v. 7 *note* 3
cxxiv., vol. v. 7 *note* 2
cxxvi., vol. v. 115 *note* 2
cxxix., vol. v. 7 *note* 2
cxxxi., vol. v. 44 *note* 2
cxxxii., vol. v. 103 *note* 2, 119, 191 *note* 6
cxxxiii., vol. v. 44 *note* 2
cxxxiv., vol. v. 114 *note* 2
cxxxvi., vol. v. 191 *note* 6
cxxxvii., vol. v. 7 *note* 3, 103 *note* 2, 116 *note* 1
cxxxviii., vol. v. 125
cxxxix., vol. v. 62 *note* 1, 114 *note* 4, 182 *note* 2, 187 *note* 1
cxl.–cxlii., vol. iv. 207 *note* 3, 211 *note* 1, 284 *note* 5
cxli., vol. iv. 279
cxliv., vol. v. 187 *note* 4
cxlvii., vol. v. 148 *note* 3, 161 *note* 1
cxlviii., vol. v. 173 *note* 2
cxlix., vol. v. 148 *note* 3, 161 *note* 1
cl., vol. v. 191 *note* 5
Psalms, the later, composition of, v. 191; none from Maccabean age, 287 *note* 3. See *Lyrics*
Psammetichus, king of Egypt, reduces Ashdod, iv. 218 sq.; his relations with Judah, 240 sq.

PSA

Psammis, son of Necho, king of Egypt, iv. 269
Psusennes, last king of the twenty-first (Tanitic) dynasty in Egypt, iii. 220; died during Solomon's reign, iv. 44
Ptolemæus, minister of Herod, v. 417
Ptolemæus, son of Chabûb, son-in-law of Simon, v. 341; murders Simon, 342; imprisons Mattathias and Judas, 342 sq.; and their mother, 343; executes them and flees across the Jordan, *ibid.*
Ptolemæus, son of Dorymenes, bribed by Menelaus, v. 295; his campaign against Judas Maccabæus, 310
Ptolemæus, son of Mennæus, v. 404 *note* 1; oppresses Damascus, 390 sq., 394; marries the widow of Aristobulus, 404; brings back Antigonus, 408; succeeded by his son, Lysanias, 411
Ptolemais, the ancient Accho, v. 314; Alexander Balas in, 327; Jonathan appears before Demetrius at, 330; Jonathan made prisoner at, 333; besieged by Alexander Jannæus, 387; but not reduced, 392; besieged by Tigranes, 393; Herod lands at, 413; Herod accompanies Octavian to, 427. See *Accho*
Ptolemy I., concedes the Macedonian Isopolity to the Judeans in Egypt, v. 237
Ptolemy Epiphanes, his agreement with Antiochus the Great, v. 284; plunges Egypt into embarrassments, 291
Ptolemy Euergetes, his expedition against the Syrian kingdom, v. 283
Ptolemy Lagi, occupies Phœnicia, Cœle-Syria and Jerusalem, v. 226
Ptolemy Lathûrus, intended to come to the rescue of Samaria, v. 353; attacks Asôchis, 387; advances through the country, 388
Ptolemy Philadelphus, liberates the Judeans in Egypt, v. 226 *note* 2, 224; encourages friendly intercourse between smaller nations, 245; sends to Jerusalem for a copy of the law, 250; consequences of his death, 282 sq.; narrative of, in the book of Aristeas, 472
Ptolemy Philomêtor, attains independent power, v. 294 *note* 5; captured by Antiochus Epiphanes, 296; assists Demetrius against Balas, 330; his death, *ibid.*; settled a dispute about the pre-eminence of Jerusalem or Gerizîm, 353 sq.; granted a sanctuary at Leontopolis to Onias, 356
Ptolemy Philopator, v. 227; his wars with Antiochus the Great, 283 sq.; narrative of him in 3 Macc., 283, 469 sq.

RAB

Ptolemy Physcon, sends Alexander Zebina to the Syrians as their king, v. 352; advances from Cyrênê after the death of his brother Philomêtor, 357
Publicans, tax-collectors under the Romans, vi. 54
Pul, king of Assyria, iv. 149 *notes* 3, 5; his conquests, 150; called in to assist Menahem, 150 *note* 6, 157; length of his reign, 299 *note* 2
Pulpit, the royal, in the temple court, iii. 251; the court-pulpit, *ibid.*
Punctuation, connection between the Hebrew and Syriac, v. 132 *note* 2
Purifications, vii. 536 sq.; increased rigour with regard to clean and unclean, viii. 299
Pûrîm, feast of, first celebrated in Persia, v. 231; Judas' victory over Nicanor, celebrated in connection with, 321; neglect and restoration of, in Egypt, 358; celebration of, in distant lands, 380; a preliminary celebration of the Passover, 380 *note* 7; a feast similar to, in Alexandria, 469; might be held a day earlier, vi. 419 *note* 3

QOBOL-AM, his attempted usurpation, after the murder of Zachariah, iv. 154
Quadratus, Christian apologist, viii. 303
Quadratus, Ummidius, Syrian governor, vii. 419 sq.
Queen-mother, the, her position at the court, iii. 372; degraded by Asa, iv. 49; power of, in Judah, 101, 134
Quirinius, P. Sulpicius, Præses of Syria, vi. 43 sq.; census of, 44 sq., 155 sq.

RAAMSES, king and city, ii. 11 sq., 67-69, 339
Rabbah, the capital of Ammon, iii. 151, 185; besieged by Joab, 154, 165; reduced by David, 159
Rabbah, the capital of Moab, taken by Jehoram, iv. 89
Rabban, rabbinical title, vi. 19; higher title than Rabbi, viii. 33
Rabbath-Ammon. See *Philadelphia*
Rabbi, vi. 232; title used at time of Christ, *ibid. note*
Rabbinic school, vi. 11 sq.
Rabbis and Rabbinism, importance of subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem, viii. 31 sq., 37 sq.; antagonism of, to Greek and Rome culture and to Christianity, 44 sq., 300; charges of, against Christianity, 149 sq.; Akîba's superiority to, 265; new mission to the heathen, 266 sq.

RAB

Rabbôni, difference of from Rabbi, vi. 232
Rachel, wife of Jacob, i. 293, 296, 371, sqq., 376 sq., sepulchre of, iii. 21
Raepta, an Arabian fortress, taken by Herod, probably identical with Ragaba, v. 443
Ragaba, in the territory of Gerasa, besieged by Alexander Jannæus, v. 392
Rages, a city of Media, deportation of Israelites to, iv. 165; said to have been founded by Seleucus I, v. 212 *note* 2
Raguel (Reuel), ii. 25
Rahab, harlot, ii. 247
Ramah (Ramathaim), city, ii. 421; residence of Samuel at, iii. 19, 47; school of the prophets at, 50; incorporated in the kingdom of Judah, iv. 3 *note* 2; conquered by Baasha, 34; probably on the site of the present el-Ram, 34 *note* 2; restored to Asa, 35; Jeremiah carried prisoner to, 275
Ramathem, a Samaritan district attached to Judah, v. 228
Ramoth, in Judah, iii. 86 *note* 3
Ramoth, in Gilead, probably ceded to the king of Damascus, by Omri, iv. 38; campaign of Ahab and Jehoshaphat against, 75; its situation, 75 *note* 4; campaign of Jehoram against the Syrians at, 94
Raphael, delineation of, in the book of Tobit, v. 211
Raphia, victory of Ptolemy Philopator at, v. 283; captured by Alexander Jannæus, 388
Raphôn, v. 313 *note* 7; captured by Judas Maccabæus, 314
Rebekah, wife of Isaac, i. 339 sq.
Rechab, an officer of Ish-bosheth's, murders him, iii. 118, 136
Rechabites, the, iv. 79 sq.; compared with the Essees, v. 371
Red Sea, passage of the Israelites through it, ii. 70–76; navigation of, iii. 263 sq.; David's conquests extended to, iv. 4; navigation of, by Jehoshaphat, 56; and by Uzziah, 143; Necho constructs a fleet in, 241
Reforms, necessity for, in Judah, iv. 232, 236; of Josiah, their violence, 239; and consequences, 239
Rehoboam, son of Solomon, succeeds him, iii. 312 sq.; prepares for war with the Ten Tribes, 314; tolerates foreign religious rites, iv. 43; fortifies cities on the south and west, 45; invasion of Judah by the Egyptians, 46; Jerusalem captured, 14 *note* 2, 46; length of his reign, 47; his family, 47
Rehum, a Persian councillor in Samaria, v. 107

RIG

Rekem, prince, ii. 335 *note* 3, comp. 193 *note* 3
Religion of Egypt, ii. 8 sq., 39 sq., 55 sq., 58; war of religions in Egypt, 57–94
Religion of Jahveh, its spirituality, 130 sq.; its requirements, iii. 288 sqq.
Religion of the Patriarchs, and of Israel in Egypt, i. 317–23, ii. 36 sqq., 108–69
Religion, the true, striving towards perfect realisation, i. 4 sq., ii. 113 sq.; instruction in provided by Jehoshaphat, iv. 54; defects of, 288 sq.; the perfect true, the way in which it can come, vi. 209 sq. 210 sq.; its miracles, 226 sq.; Christian, its nature and establishment, vii. 84 sq., 138 sq.
Religions, foreign, toleration of, by Solomon, iii. 297 sq.
Remaliah, father of Pekah, iv. 157
Rephaim, nation, i. 227–29
Rephaim, valley of, iii. 146; its situation, 147 *note* 6
Resh-Gâlûtha, the head of the exiles, representative of Judeans in Parthia, viii. 295
Rêssa, a fortress, south of Jerusalem, v. 413
Resurrection of the dead, not believed by the Samaritans, viii. 83; nor by Dositheus, 95; meaning of denial of (I. Cor. xv. 12), 133
Return from the Captivity, number of those who accompanied Zerubbabel, v. 82 sq.
Revenues, royal, under Solomon, iii. 292 sqq.
Revolution of Jehu, the, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 96 sqq.; its moral and social effects, 114 sqq.
Reuben and his tribe, i. 373 sq., 422, ii. 296–98, 324 sq.
Rezeph, a city, west of the Euphrates, iv. 150 *note* 6
Rezin, king of the Arameans, alliance with Pekah, iv. 158, 170; slain by Tiglath-Pileser, 160
Rezon, one of Hadadezer's generals, iii. 156; defeated by Solomon's troops, 218
Rhesa Meshullam, said to have succeeded Zerubbabel, v. 118 *note* 8
Rhinocolûra, on the Egyptian boundary, v. 392
Rhodes, Herod visits Octavian in, v. 427
Riblah, in the north of Canaan, ii. 293 *note* 1; Necho at, iv. 251; where Jehoahaz visits him, 252; Nabuchodrozzor at, 274; Zedekiah brought to, 274
Righteous, or Upright, book of the, a collection of national songs, iii. 282

RIM

Rimmon, an Aramean god, ii. 332; worshipped in Israel, iv. 126 *note* 6
Rimmon, in the south of Judah, ii. 192, 353 *note* 3, iv. 3 *note* 1
Rimmona, an Aramean goddess, worshipped in Israel, iv. 126 *note* 6
Rizpah, Saul's concubine, married to Abner, iii. 115; her two sons given up to the Gibeonites, 136 sq.
Rogel, well of, south-east of Jerusalem, iii. 253
Rogelim, in Gilead, iii. 185
Roman governors of Palestine, their character and prerogatives, vi. 36–42; citizenship, possessed by Paul, vii. 277; by Silas, 361; exempting from crucifixion, 497
Romans, Paul's epistle to the, vii. 398
Rome, Judeans in, v. 240; attitude of, to the Syrian disputes, 316; league with, 322; Jonathan despatches ambassadors to, 332; Numenius sent with gifts to, by Simon, 336; embassies of John Hyrcanus, 352, 364; final supremacy of, 456; the direct rule of over Judah, vi. 36 sq.; Judean community there, 82 sq.; empire of, in relation to Christianity, viii. 225 sq. See *Paul* and *Peter*
Rufi filius. See *Annius*
Rufus Annius, Roman governor, vi. 64
Rufus, an officer of Archelaus, v. 452
Rufus, Terentius, his camp at Jerusalem, vii. 609
Ruma, in Galilee, grave of Jonah shown at, iv. 123 *note* 3
Runners, the, iv. 135 *note* 3
Runners' gate, the, in the temple, iv. 135
Ruth, book of, iv. 285; book of Tobit resembles, v. 211
Ruth, the Moabitess, i. 153–56

SABAKON, Seveh, or Sô, king of Egypt, iv. 163 *note* 2
Sabaoth, Jahveh of [A.V. Lord of Hosts], iii. 62, 73
Sabbæus, a Samaritan disputant in Alexandria, v. 354
Sabbath, question of fighting on, v. 400
Jesus cures a demoniac on, vi. 278 sq.; Judeans charge him with breaking it, 283 sq.; his disciples pluck corn on, 289 sq.; he complains of injustice of Scribes for condemning his conduct, 362 sq.; cures a man born blind on, 364 sq.; not a valid pretext for a sentence against him, 373 sq., 431; requirement to work on, vii. 198 sq.; Judeans fight on, 505, 512, 519 sq.; ridiculed in heathen authors, viii. 20
Sabbath-pulpit, in the temple court, iii. 251; stripped of its ornaments for the Assyrians, by Ahaz, iv. 172
Sabbatical year, the, its observance reordained by Ezra, v. 166 sq., 343, 416
Sabians, viii. 127
Sabinus, a Roman officer, despatched to Jerusalem by Augustus, v. 452; influences Augustus against Archelaus, 455
Sacrifices, human, offered by the king of Moab, iv. 90; by Ahaz, 169; by Manasseh, 209; at Jerusalem, v. 113; regularity of, 114 *note* 2; during the siege, 344, 398, 416; for Cæsar in Palestine, vi. 40; for the Cæsars in the temple, vii. 309 sq., 502; of the Christians, 118 sq.; the daily, 441; during the siege of Jerusalem, 602
Sacrificial fire, ii. 382
Saddok, a Zealot of the Law, and supporter of Judas the Gaulonite, vi. 48
Sadducees, the, origin and character of, v. 275 sqq.; disputes of the Pharisees with, 368; contrasted with the Essees, 371, 374, 378; their position under Alexander Jannæus, 387; in relation to first Apostles, vii. 152 sq.; to Paul, 435 sq.; disappearance of, viii. 39; their Canon, 339
Salah, Forefather, i. 264, 268
Salamis, in Cyprus, devastated by the Judeans, viii. 274
Salem, a northern city, on the Jordan, i. 307, iii. 187 *note* 2
Salim, a place near which John baptised, probably in S.E. Judah, and the same as Tristram's *Rug'ûm Salâmeh*, vi. 198 sq.
Salômê, daughter of Herodias, vi. 72
Salômê, sister of Herod, intrigues against Mariamne, v. 425, 428; her suspicions of Alexander and Aristobulus, 439, 441; marries Alexis, 445; releases the deputies shut up in Jericho, 449; Herod's bequests to her, 450; proceeds to Rome, 451; taxes demanded by Augustus, 455; her death, vi. 71
Salômê, mother of James and John, vi. 181; her request for her two sons, 387; at the cross, 442
Salômê, wife of Alexander Jannæus. See *Alexandra*
Salt valley, the, the Idumeans defeated in, iii. 157
Samaria, Omri reigns six years in, iv. 22; made the capital of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes by him, 37; residence of Ahab at, 40; attacked by Benhadad, 71 sqq.; sons of the prophets in, 80; residence of Hosea at, 131; Shallum's reign at, 154; seized by Menahem, 155; siege and destruction of, 21, 117, 164, 177, 299; new settlement in, 215

SAM

sq.; ruled by Josiah, 227; a Persian officer resident in, v. 88; occupied by aliens after the destruction of Jerusalem, 89; colonists of heathen extraction in, 99; language of, 182; its importance at the time of Zerubbabel, 220; subjugation of, by Alexander, 222, 227; restored by Perdicas, 227, 236; said to have been made tributary to Jerusalem by Alexander, 228; reduced by John Hyrcanus, 350; and destroyed, 353; when restored, takes the name of Gabiniopolis, 401; Herod's partiality for, 414, 430; Herod marries Mariamne in, 416; ceded to Cleopatra, 425 *note* 2; Herod retires to, after the murder of Mariamne, 428; rebuilt under the name of Sebastê, 430; Alexander and Aristobulus executed at, 444; Roman troops at, 453; its loyalty rewarded, 455; under the Romans, vi. 37; its contentions with the Judeans, 63; the woman of, 264 sq.; Christianity carried thither, vii. 179; rising of inhabitants, 507; Vespasian sends forces against, 547

Samaritan Chronicle. See *Chronicon Samaritanum*

Samaritan Pentateuch, the, v. 217 sqq., 279, 281, viii. 323

Samaritans, or Samarians, settlement of, under Asarhaddon II., iv. 215 sq.; the fictitious account of their return, v. 96; propose to assist in the erection of the second temple, 103; their offer rejected, 104; relations with Jerusalem, 121; build a temple of their own, 213 sqq., 220 sqq.; employed as soldiers by Alexander, 237; in Rome, 240; in Egypt, 253; their traditions about the Greek translation of the law, 253 sq.; condition of, during the Greek period, 277 sqq.; their philosophical schools, 279; limit themselves to their Pentateuch, 281; tendencies of, in the Greek age, 287 sq.; maltreat the inhabitants of Mareshah, 352 sq.; punished by John Hyrcanus, 353; hostility between them and the Judeans, *ibid.*; called Cutheans, 354; resembled the Essees in their reverence for Moses, 375; ill-treated by Archelaus, 456 *note* 4; after the destruction of Jerusalem, viii. 81 sq.; religious divisions of, 92 sq.; their conduct in the war of Bar-Kokheba, 285, 290; the latest books of Pentateuch of, see *Pentateuch*; their Canon, 362

Sameas, or Shammai, a member of the Synedrium, v. 407; advises surrender of Jerusalem to Herod, 413; honoured by Herod, 423

Samega, probably on the lake of Mêrôm, taken by John Hyrcanus, v. 349

Samosata, Herod visits Antony at, v. 415

Σαμψήρα of the Persian Shâhnâmeh, vii. 404

Samsæans, Samaritan sect, viii. 127

Samsigeramus, king of Emessa, vii. 266

Samson, Nazirite and man of the people, ii. 396–401; the round number of his feats, 401–7

Samuel, the Prophet, ii. 419–30; his sons, 429; anoints Saul at Ramah, iii. 20; summons an assembly at Mizpeh, 23; lays down his office, 28; rejects Saul for sacrificing at Gilgal, 31 sq.; for sparing Agag, 39; sacrifices Agag himself, 39; concedes full powers to the king, 41; breach between himself and Saul, 47 sq.; anoints David, 65 sq.; protects him from the jealousy of Saul, 78; dies two years before Saul, 53; organisation of the Levites referred to him by the Chronicler, 247

Sanballat, governor of the Samaritans, v. 153; his anger at the rebuilding of Jerusalem, 154; league with the Philistines, 155; his last attempt, 156; his letter to Nehemiah, *ibid.*; later tradition of him as governor of Samaria under Darius III., 213 sq.; submitting to Alexander, 214; and obtaining leave to build a temple on Gerizim, 220; his death, *ibid.*; unhistorical character of this later narrative of, 215

Sanctuaries, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, at Dan and Bethel, iv. 27

Sanctuary, the, right of refuge in, iii. 214; in the temple, 235, 238 sq.; its furniture, 241 sqq.; importance conferred on Jerusalem by, 306; pilgrimages to the Davidic, at Jerusalem, iv. 25; at Shechem, ill treatment of fugitives at, 155; unity of the, enforced in Deuteronomy, 225 sq.

Sanhedrin, or Synedrium, the, or Council of the Seventy, its first institution, v. 167; its jurisdiction, 168; Herod appears before, 407; its greater freedom under the Romans, vi. 38, 41; in the Zealots' state, vii. 529

Saph, a Philistine giant, slain by Sibbechai, iii. 148

Saphôn, in Galilee, v. 387

Sappho, a fortress south of Arûs, v. 454

Sara, story of, in the book of Tobit, v. 210 sq.

Saracens. See *B'ne Kedem*

Sarah, wife of Abraham, i. 292 sq., 324, 327

Sarak, last king of Nineveh, iv. 255; burned himself in his palace on the fall of his capital, 257 *note* 2

Saramalla, advises Phasael to flee, v. 412

Sardanapalus, king of Babylon, iv. 149 *note* 5

SAR

Sardians, the, their decree in favour of the Judeans, v. 364
Sardis, Judeans in, v. 239
Sarepta, a city of Sidon, Elijah at, iv. 68, 105
Sargon, king of Assyria, successor of Shalmaneser, iv. 178
Sarira, in Ephraim, native city of Jeroboam I., iv. 32 *note* 1; name given to Jeroboam's mother in the LXX. Cod. Vat., *ibid.*
Sasabazzar, or Sheshbazzar, the court name of Zerubbabel, v. 87, 88 *note* 1
Satan, meaning of, iv. 55 *note* 3
Saturninus, Roman governor of Syria, intercedes for Alexander and Aristobulus, v. 444
Saul, a Benjamite, the son of Kish, iii. 18; his genealogy, 18 *note* 1; visits Samuel to inquire for the lost asses, 19; is anointed by him, 20; encounters the three signs, 21; relieves Jabesh Gilead, 24; his authority confirmed at Gilgal, 25; later representations of his election, 27; raises levies against the Philistines, 30; rejected by Samuel for sacrificing at Gilgal, 31; attacks the Philistines, 34; his vow, 35; campaign against the Amalekites, 37; rejected by Samuel for sparing Agag, 39; his royal prerogative, 43; his wars, 43; expels sorcerers, 44; his jealousy, 46; real cause of his breach with Samuel, 47; among the prophets at Ramah, 50; duration of his reign, 51; consults the witch of Endor, 51; his jealousy of David, 73; attempts to kill him, *ibid.*; anger with Jonathan, 78, 80; orders the massacre of the priests at Nob, 90; pursues David in the wilderness of Ziph, 92 sq.; at En-gedi, 94; narratives of David's magnanimity towards him, 95, 96; his relations with Moab, 149; his death at the battle of Mount Gilboa, 106; treatment of his body by the Philistines, 110; buried at Zelah by David, 137; his descendants, 135 sq.; his cruelty to the Gibeonites, 136; his estates, 181, 191
Saul, late member of Herodean family, vii. 483, 503, 515
Sayings, Collected, see Translator's Preface, vi. 218, 309, 424, and often
Scaurus, a general of Pompey, decides in favour of Aristobulus, v. 398; assisted by Antipater, 401
Sceptics, or mockers, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 115; in Judah, 147, 210
Sceptre, the, a mark of royalty, iii. 6, 73, 272
Sceva, high-priest, vii. 392

SEL

Schools of the Prophets, ii. 424 sq., iii. 21; at Ramah, 49 sq., 89; development of poetry in, 52; in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 80, 110
Science, commencement of, in Israel, iii. 275
Scopas, an Egyptian general of Ptolemy Epiphanes, his campaign against Antiochus the Great, v. 284
Scopus, hill north of Jerusalem, Cestius encamps there, vii. 513; Titus, 589, 591
Scribes, the, trained up by Ezra, v. 144; their services to the people, 145 sqq., 367; their Biblical science, 489; the boy Jesus in the temple before them, vi. 189; Abba a title used by them, 232; dispute Jesus' right to forgive sins, 286 sq.
Scripturalism, rise of, in consequence of the reforms of Josiah, iv. 239
Scriptures, sacred, read in public worship under Ezra, v. 146 sq.; interpretation of, vi. 29 sq.; schools for study of, 87 sq.; Christ's use of, 233 sq.; how regarded and interpreted by Philo, vii. 202 sq.; penalty for their desecration, 417; interpretation of, amongst Christians, 159 sq. See *Bible* and *Canon*
Scythians, the, advance from the north-east into Southern Asia, iv. 151, 228; march into Media, 228; their wild warfare, 229; reach Egypt, 230; settle in Askelon, 230; devastate Canaan, 230; besiege Jerusalem, 231; expelled from Judah, 240; their leaders destroyed by Cyaxares, 253; employed by the Chaldeans, 255 sq.
Scythopolis (Beth-shean), south-west of the lake of Galilee, iv. 231; for a long time a free city, v. 89, 236; chastised by the sons of John Hyrcanus, 353; Pompey marches through, 399; called Nysa, 401 *note* 5; one of the cities of the Decapolis, 455 *note* 4; massacre of Judeans at, vii. 508. See *Beth-shean*
Sea, the bronze, in the temple, iii. 244, 251 *note* 4
Sebastê, the name of Samaria after its restoration by Herod, v. 401. See *Samaria*
Sebuæans, a Samaritan sect, viii. 93
Seder Olam rabba and zutta, i. 200 sq., 209; referred to, viii. 49
Seer, use of the title, iv. 129 *note* 1
Segub, youngest son of Hiel, iv. 40
Seir, nation, i. 344 sq.
Sela, the centre of the rule of the Nabateans, v. 351. See *Petra*
Seleuceia, a city near the Lake of Jordan, v. 236
Seleuceia, on the Orontes, captured by Antiochus the Great, v. 283
Seleuceia, near the Lake of Galilee, re-

duced by Alexander Jannæus, v. 391; its position, 391 *note* 6
Seleucia, on the Lake of Merom, vii. 539, 550
Seleucia in Parthia, Jews seek refuge there, vii. 523
Seleucidæ, the, references to them in the book of Enoch, v. 346
Seleucus I. Nicator, transports Judeans to Antioch, v. 237
Seleucus IV. Philopator, son of Antiochus the Great, v. 291; sends Heliodorus to Jerusalem, 292; his death, 292; alluded to in Dan. vii. 24, 304 *note* 1
Seleucus Callinicus, his wars with Egypt, v. 283
Seleucus Ceraunus, son of Seleucus Callinicus, his early death, v. 283
Semiramis, king of Babylon, his successors, iv. 149 *notes* 3, 5
Seneh, mountain ridge of, iii. 33
Sennacherib, king of Assyria, succeeds Sargon, iv. 178; his name, 178 *note* 4; invades Egypt, 161 *note* 2, 179; his retreat, 180; enters Judah and lays it waste, 180; receives Hezekiah's ambassadors at Lachish, 181; his letter to Hezekiah, 182; disasters to his army, 183; his flight, 183; his death, 188, 214 *note* 5; length of his reign, 299 *note* 2
Sepharam, abbreviated form of Sepharvaim, iv. 162 *note* 4
Sepharvaim, destroyed by the Assyrians, iv. 162 *note* 4; settlers from, sent into Samaria, 216
Sépher Hajjashar, the, compiled in Solomon's time, iv. 198
Sepher Toledoth Jeshua Ha-Nossri, vi. 142
Sepphoris (Dio-Cæsarea), in Galilee, attacked by Ptolemy Lathûrus, v. 387; made the centre of a district, 403; palace of Herod at, 436 *note* 2; insurrection of Judas in, 453; chastised by Varus, *ibid.*; restored by Antipas, vi. 75 sq.; opens gates to Romans, vii. 512; strong Roman feeling, 533 sq.; Josephus there, 537; subsequently Dio-Cæsarea, viii. 82
Septuagint Version, origin of the, v. 249 sqq., 472; rejection of, by the Rabbis, viii. 270; Canon of, 341 sq.
Sergius Paulus, Proconsul of Crete, vii. 342
'Sermon on the Mount,' vi. 308 sq.
Serôn, a Syrian general, defeated at Beth-horon by Judas Maccabæus, v. 309
Serpent, brazen, ii. 173 sq.; destroyed by Hezekiah, iv. 173
Serpent's pool, or Dragon-well, position of the, iii. 254 *note* 2, 236 *note* 1
Serpent-stone, the, conspiracy of Adonijah at, iii. 210 *note* 1
Servant of Jahveh, meaning of the phrase, v. 42, 45
Sesonchis (Hebrew, Shishak), successor of Psusennes, king of Egypt, iv. 44; not to be identified with Sesostris, 44 *note* 6; protected Jeroboam, 45; said to have given him in marriage the sister of his queen, 32 *note* 1; campaign of, narrated by the Chronicler, 51 *note* 4
Sesostris, not to be identified with Sesonchis, iv. 44 *note* 6
Seth, son of Adam, i. 264 sq.
Sethon, king of northern and central Egypt, iv. 180; his quarrels with the military caste, 188
Seveh, king of Egypt, alliance of with Pekah, iv. 163
Seventy disciples of Christ, only mentioned by Luke, vi. 299; sent forth according to Luke on trial-journeys like the Twelve, 326; who they were, vii. 131
Seventy, the Council of. See *Council*
Seventy sons of Gideon, ii. 388 sq.
Seventy souls who went with Jacob into Egypt, i. 415 sq.
Severus, Julius, Roman general, viii. 286, 289
Shaaraim, a city of Judah, iii. 72
Shâlîsh, title of an officer in David's army, iii. 140; in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 135 *note* 3
Shalisha, situation of, iii. 19 *note* 3; shortened from Baal-shalisha, 257 *note* 3
Shallum, assassinates Zechariah, and becomes king of the Ten Tribes, iv. 154
Shallum, younger son of Josiah, raised to the throne on his father's death, under the name of Jehoahaz, iv. 251
Shalman, king of Assyria, his conquests, iv. 150
Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, iv. 162; attacks Tyre, 162; imprisons Hoshea, 164; destroys the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, 164; lays waste the country of Judah, 175; spares Jerusalem, 177; dies, 178; deportation of Israelites under, 215; length of his reign, 299 *note* 2
Shamgar, judge, ii. 317, 374
Shammâh, son of Agee, a colonel in David's army, iii. 141
Shammai, Rabbi, contemporary and opponent of Hillel, vi. 13 *sq.*; sayings of, 28 sq.; pupil and rival of Hillel, 33 sq. See *Sameas*
Shaphan, finance minister of Hezekiah, iv. 233, 275

SHA

Shaphat of Abel-meholah, father of Elisha, iv. 80 sq.
Shaveh, ancient name for Salem, iii. 187 *note* 2
Shealtiel, father of Zerubbabel, v. 83 *note* 5
Sheba, its position, iii. 284 *note* 2
Sheba, queen of, visits Solomon, iii. 277, 284
Sheba, son of Bichri, revolt of, iii. 193 sqq.; flees to Abel, 194; put to death by the inhabitants, 195
Shebna, chamberlain of Hezekiah, iii. 269; of Ahaz, 271 *note* 1; denounced by Isaiah, iv. 169 *note* 1
Shechaniah, a layman of Jerusalem, in the time of Ezra, v. 141
Shechem, Hivvite prince, i. 378
Shechem (Sichem), city, i. 305 sq., ii. 278 sq., 342 sq., 413; meeting of the deputies in, iii. 312; capital of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes under Jeroboam, iv. 23; residence of Hosea at, 131; ill-treatment of fugitives at the sanctuary of, 155; the ancient capital of Ephraim, v. 218; its subsequent fame, 220 sq.; made the subject of an epic poem, 260; name transformed to Sychar, 220 *note* 7
Shechemites, v. 220 *note* 7
Shem, son of Noah, i. 264, 279 sqq.; descendants of, iv. 153
Shemaiah, a prophet of Judah, iii. 301; forbids Rehoboam to make war on the Ten Tribes, 314; mentioned, iv. 44
Shemaiah, a prophet, his intended treachery against Nehemiah, v. 157
Shemer, sold the hill of Samaria to Omri, iv. 37
Shenazar, a Chaldean name, v. 33 *note* 2
Shephelah, the, the great plain of Judah, iii. 85
Sherezer, a Chaldean name, v. 33 *note* 2
Sheshbazzar. See *Sasabazzar*
Shethar-Boznai, a Persian officer in Western Syria, v. 110
Shiloh, ancient sacred city in Ephraim, ii. 260 sq., 277 sq., 353, 412–15, iii. 301, 304
Shiloh, Gen. xlix. 10, no Messianic meaning in, iv. 19 *note* 2, 203 *note* 3
Shimeah, brother of David, father of Jonadab, iii. 170
Shimei, son of Gerar, insults David on his flight, iii. 181; does homage to him on his return, 190; executed by Solomon's orders, 215
Shimshai, a royal secretary in Samaria, v. 107
Shishak, king of Egypt, iv. 51; date of his accession, 301. See *Sesonchis*
Shobar, near Damascus, grave of Elijah at, iv. 113 *note* 6

SIM

Shobi, son of Nahash of Rabbah, assists David, iii. 184
Shochoh, a city of Judah, iii. 65
Shôm'rôn, name of the city of Samaria, iv. 37 *note* 4
Shulamite, the, in the Canticles, iv. 42 *note* 2, 134 *note* 3
Shunem, probably identical with Sôlam, iii. 103 *note* 5; the lady of, her son restored to life by Elisha, iv. 85; advised to quit the country, 87; returns and receives back her estates, 87
Shur, on the Egyptian frontier, iii. 38
Shûshak. See *Sesonchis*
Sibbechai, slays a Philistine giant, iii. 148
Sibylline verses, the, v. 261, 360 sq.; poets, viii. 46 sq.; the poem of a disciple of the Baptist, 120 sq., 126
Sicarii, the Scourge of, vii. 424 sq. See *Fehme*
Sichem (Neapolis), the present city Nablûs, vi. 265, vii. 554; renamed Flavia Neapolis, viii. 82, 288
Sidon, Scopas shut up in, v. 284; the Judeans in Galilee, oppressed by, 314; taxes for Rome taken to, 406 *note* 4; Christ's journey thither, vi. 347; influence of Christians there, vii. 508 sq.
Sidonian artists, assist Solomon in the erection of the temple, iii. 226; sailors employed in transporting timber for the second temple, v. 101
Sidonians, name applied to the Samaritans, iv. 216 *note* 2
Signs, employment of, by the prophets, iv. 31 *note* 1, 186
Sihon, king of the Amorites, ii. 205 sq., 209, 295
Silas, prefect of Agrippa I.'s army, vii. 267; succeeded by Alexas, 273
Silas (Silvanus), companion of Paul, vii. 361, 364; leaves the Apostle, 387; assists Peter in composition of his epistle, 464
Silas, tyrant of Lysias, v. 404 *note* 1
Silla, or Sulla, a flight of steps at Jerusalem, iii. 258 *note* 3
Silo, a Roman officer under Ventidius, v. 413
Siloah, south of Jerusalem, vii. 501
Siloah, well of, iii. 254
Simeon, tribe of, i. 379, ii. 287-89; not included in the computation of tribes at the disruption of the kingdom, iv. 2 sq.; whether or not included in Judah, 3 *note* 3; spreads towards the south under Hezekiah, 187
Simon I., the Just, traditions of, v. 169; son of Onias I., high-priest, 270
Simon II., son of Onias II., high-priest,

v. 272; his additions to the temple, 273; restores the walls of Jerusalem, *ibid.*
Simon, a former slave of Herod, assumes the crown, v. 453
Simon, a model Zealot, vii. 194
Simon, an Essee, v. 373 *note* 5
Simon Magus, vi. 70 (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 4. 1); character and motives of, vii. 179 sq.; relations to Simon Peter, 181 sq.; his philosophy, and the book ascribed to him, viii. 83 sq.; his adherents, 90 sq.
Simon of Cyrene, vi. 440
Simon, one of the 'sons of Tobias,' invites the Syrians to plunder the temple, v. 292
Simon. See *Bar-Kokheba*
Simon, second son of Mattathias, brother of Judas Maccabæus, v. 308; his successes in Galilee, 314; vainly attempts to arrest the march of Nicanor, 321; besieged in Beth-basi, 326; captures Beth-zur, 331; occupies Joppa and Ascalôn, 332; fortifies Adida, *ibid.*; equips an army against Tryphon, 333; recognised as high-priest by Demetrius, 334; obtains possession of the temple-mountain and citadel of Jerusalem, 335; his administration, 336; designated commander-in-chief, and prince of the nation, 336; erects a monument to his father and brothers in Môde'im, 337; negotiations with Antiochus Sidêtês, 338; appoints his son Johanan to the chief command, 339; his coinage, *ibid.*, 340; perpetual sovereignty conferred on him, 361; called the 'Prince of the Pious' in 1 Macc., 463
Simon, the son of Boethus, a priest of Jerusalem, made high-priest by Herod, v. 441; deposed, 447
Simon, the son of Gamaliel, vii. 194; John of Giskhala sent to, 539; a leader of the moderate party, 561 sq.
Simon, the son of Giora, vii. 512, 531; head of the popular Zealots, 568 sq.; received into Jerusalem, 571 sq.; as leader of the defence of the city, 590 sq.; his end, 610 sq.
Simon, son of the high-priest Ananias, vii. 503
Simon the Leper, father of Lazarus, vi. 368; feast at his house, 387
Simorg, the bird, mixed up with the legends of al-Chidr, iv. 113 *note* 7
Sin, desert of, ii. 99 sq.; universality of emphasised in Apocalypse of Baruch, viii. 60
Sinai, ii. 43, 97 sq.; journey of Israel thither, 95–101; peninsula of, 196 sq.; Elijah at, iv. 107 sq.
Sinaitic peninsula, mining operations in, iv. 192
Sinim, the, the Pelusians, v. 3 *note* 1
Sirach, the Son of, book of. See *Wisdom of Jesus*
Sisera, Canaanite general, ii. 375–77
Smerdis, the pseudo-Magian, also called Artashashta, succeeds Cambyses, v. 107; succeeded by Darius, 108
Sodom, city, i. 104, 242, 313 sq., 320 sq.
Soemus, an officer of Herod, v. 427
Sogane, in Gaulonitis, vii. 539, 550
Sohem (Sohemus), contributes forces to Cestius, vii. 511
Solomon, king of Israel, ii. 32 *note*; his birth, iii. 168; his name, 204 *note* 1, 223 *note* 1, 270; authorities for his history, 205; age at his accession, 208; proclaimed king, 211; has Adonijah executed, 212; banishes Abiathar from Jerusalem, 213; has Joab executed, 214; and Shimei, 215; his foreign relations, 216 sqq.; his wars, 216–21; marries an Egyptian princess, 220; organisation of his government, 224 sqq.; resolves to erect the temple, 226; preparations for it, 229 sqq.; its various parts, 235–45; presides at its dedication, 246 sq.; his palace, 248 sqq.; its site, 249; its various parts, 249 sq.; his porch, 250; his throne, *ibid.*; his entry to the temple, 251; his court- and sabbath-pulpits, *ibid.*; his public works, 251 sqq.; improves the water supply of Jerusalem, 253; his gardens and parks, 256; his measures for the security of the realm, 257 sqq.; towers and vineyards, 257; fortifies Jerusalem, 258 sq.; erects a chain of forts round the kingdom, 259; introduces a new style of arms, 259 sq.; promotes trade, 260 sqq.; by land, 261 sq.; by sea, 262 sqq.; his revenues, 264, 293; his state, 265, 271; his administration, 266 sqq.; his officers, overseers, &c., 270; manners of his court, 270 sqq.; his mule, 271; progress in science, art, and literature during his reign, 274 sqq.; sends problems to Hiram, 277; is visited by the queen of Sheba, 277, 284; his wisdom, 279 sqq.; composes proverbs, 280; and songs, 281; his wives, 291; his lavish expenditure, 292; surrenders twenty cities to Hiram, 292; supply of his table, 295; relation to the priesthood, 296 sqq.; his toleration of heathen religions, 297 sq.; whether he married a daughter of Hiram, 297 *note* 2; officiated occasionally as high-priest, 299; his relation to prophetism, 299 sqq.; instability of his rule, 307 sq.; later representations of his greatness, 242, 315 sq.; God appears to him in Gibeon, 316; his judgment between the harlots,

316; his age, 317 *note* 2; place of his burial, 273 sq.; subsequently venerated for his wisdom, 318; his ring, 319; said to have understood the language of animals, 319; the ancestor of the Ethiopian-Christian kings, 319; his golden table, 319; proverbs of, collections of, iv. 198, 220; Psalms of, v. 301 sq., 225 *note* 1; table of, 400 *note* 3; sepulchre of, Herod's treatment of, 435; the Wisdom of, 479 sqq.; writings under his name in Canon, viii. 334
Solomon's Porch in the temple where Christ taught, vi. 360
Solyma, origin of the name, iii. 122 *note* 1
Solyme in Gaulonitis, vii. 539
Solymi, the, supposed by Josephus to be the inhabitants of Jerusalem, v. 118
Song of Solomon, iii. 165, 257, 265, 282, 291, see *Canticles*; of the Three Holy Children, v. 486 sq., 460 *note* 4, 462 *note* 1
Songs, i. 17 sq., ii. 31, 203, 205–7, 354–56; of David, iii. 57, 67, 134, 197; of Solomon, 281; collections of, 282; in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 9 *note* 1, 43, 58, 194 *note* 6; in Judah, 58, 197 sq.; collections of, 198, 284; artificial arrangement of, in the last age of literature, 280 sqq.; composition of, during the Captivity, v. 16 sq., 20; of the new Jerusalem, 187 sq.; of the Samaritans, 279, 281. See *Lyrics*
'Son of God,' as applied to Christ, vi. 114
Sons of the prophets, iv. 80, 110; of Eden, an Aramean tribe, 150 *note* 6
Sôphênê, not to be identified with Zobah, iii. 154 *note* 2
Sôpher, the, officer at Solomon's court, iii. 267
Sôpherîm (Learned), the, a semi-religious order in Israel, iv. 79 *note* 4
Sources, of the early history, i. 11–203; of the Mosaic history, ii. 15–34; of the history of Joshua, 229–35; historical, for life of Christ, heathen, vi. 137 sq.; Jewish, 138 sq.; Christian, 142–49; of history of Apostolic Age, vii. 23 sq.
Sosius, a Roman general under Antony, v. 415; advances against Jerusalem, 416
Southern kingdom. See *Judah*
'Sovereignty of Jahveh,' after the liberation, v. 55 sq.
Spartans, the, ambassadors from, v. 245; ambassadors sent by Jonathan to, 352
Spasinus Charax, chief city and kingdom south of Adiabene, vii. 403
Spirit, the Holy, coming of, vii. 91 sq., 107 sq.; communication of, 135 sq.
Spirits, evil, iv. 55 *note* 3

Spirituality of God, ii. 120–23
Ssabians, or Mandæans, later disciples of the Baptist, iv. 160, viii. 127
Star, the, in Amos v. 25, probably Astarte, iv. 40 *note* 8
Star-worship, introduced by Ahaz, iv. 169; renewed by Manasseh, 208
State-annals, the, i. 136–38, iv. 50 *note* 3, 52 *note* 4, 57 *note* 2, 135 *note* 5, 140 *note* 3, 160, 171 *note* 1, 239 *note* 2
Stephen, Protomartyr, one of Seven Deacons, vii. 145; his contention with the people, 157; Luke's account of his defence, 159 sq.; his martyrdom and its effects, 162 sq.
Steps, the flight of, from Solomon's palace to the temple, iii. 251
'*Sthirna* (or *dhărnā*) *sitting*,' custom in India, vi. 66
Stoics, among the Judeans, v. 257
Strato, tower of (Stratônos-Pyrgos), on the coast, v. 236; besieged by Alexander Jannæus, 387; becomes Cæsarea, 430, vii. 423
'Streets' in Samaria, iv. 38 *note* 4
Strophes, use of, in poetic and prophetic composition, iv. 198
Succoth, in the Jordan valley, i. 305, 391, ii. 386 sq., iii. 235
Suffa, Mount, north of Hauran, iii. 154 *note* 2
Suicide, of the Zealots, viii. 78; allowed in Xystus' Proverbs, 250
Sukkîm, the, iv. 46 *note* 1. See *Cave-dwellers*
Sûlammith, i.e. maiden of Shunem, the heroine of the Canticles, iv. 42 *note* 2, 134 *note* 1
Sultan's pool, the, at Jerusalem, iii. 254 *note* 5
Sun, eclipse of at death of Christ, vi. 444
Sun, horses of the, introduced by Ahaz, iv. 169
Sunday, the Christian, vii. 90; origin of, 125 sq.; difference between Paul and Pharisaic party concerning, 388
Sun-dial, the, erected by Ahaz on the palace at Jerusalem, iv. 169; retrogression of the shadow on, for Hezekiah, 486
Superstition of the Rabbis, viii. 43
Supper, Last, of Christ, vi. 414 sq.; on 13th of Nisan, 417 sq.; Iscariot present at, 421
Susakin, king of Egypt. See *Sesonchis*
Susanchites, or Elamites, deported to Samaria, iv. 216 *note* 1
Susanna, book of, v. 487; subject of a drama, 417 *note* 3
Sychar, origin of the name i. 220 *note* 7
Sychar, unknown place near Nablûs, vi. 264 sq.

Syllæus, an Arab chief, v. 442; opposes Herod in Rome, 443; meets Antipater at Rome, 446
Symeon, bishop of the parent church, viii. 187 sq.
Synagogue, the Great (Sanhedrîn), restoration after the destruction of Jerusalem, viii. 34; resistance to, 261. See *Assembly*
Synagogues, erection of, v. 243; rise and multiplicity of, vii. 307 sq. See *Libertini*
Synedrium, the. See *Sanhedrîn*
Syrian troops in Palestine, v. 284

Taanim, founders of the *Mishna*, viii. 32
Tabernacle, the holy, ii. 18 sq.; its removal, 413; transferred to Jerusalem, iii. 129; the Mosaic, at Gibeon, 129; relation of its dimensions to the temple, 235; removed from Gibeon, 245
Tabernacles, the, feast of, kept in Ezra's time, v. 144
Table, Solomon's golden, iii. 319
Table, the sacred, in the Holy Place, iii. 243; legend connected with, viii. 65
Tabor, the Terebinth of, iii. 21
Tabrimmon, father of Benhadad, king of Damascus, iv. 24 *note* 5
Tacitus, the historian, ii. 90
Tadmor, or Thammor (Palmyra), built by Solomon, iii. 261
Tahpanes, an Egyptian queen, iii. 217
Talmai, king of Geshur, grandfather of Absalom, iii. 172
Talmud, references in, to Christ, vi. 141 sq. See *Mishna*
Talmudism, the nature of, viii. 36 sq.
Tamar, the daughter of David, iii. 170; outraged by Amnon, 171
Tanis (Zoan), in northern Egypt, i. 399, ii. 82; seat of the government of Sethon, iv. 180
Taphne, in Egypt, tradition that Jeremiah was stoned there, iv. 276 *note* 3; Israelites in, v. 3 *note* 1
Taphon, fortified by Bacchides, v. 325 *note* 2
Tarichææ, on the lake of Galilee, v. 403; given to Agrippa by Nero, vii. 422; Josephus flees to, 537; populace suspects Josephus, 538; volunteers collect at, against Vespasian, 548; horrors at its capture, 549
Tarpelites, an eastern tribe deported to Samaria, iv. 216 *note* 1
Tarshish, ships of, iii. 263 *note* 1
Tarsus, Paul's birth-place, vii. 276 sq., 327
Tartan, general of Sargon, reduces Ashdod, iv. 178; advances against Jerusalem, 182

Task-work. See *Forced Labour*
Tatnai, governor of Western Syria, v. 110
Taurus, a fortress near Jericho, v. 401 *note* 7
Taxation of Israel under Solomon, iii. 293 sq.
Taxes, paid to Rome, v. 406 *note* 4; imposed by Augustus on the Herodeans, 455; under the Romans, vi. 42; immunity from, 356 sq.; of the temple, 356; remissions in Jerusalem by Agrippa I., vii. 262; refused by Zealots, 500, 502; due to the Capitol, 612; poll-tax to the Capitol, viii. 27, 78 sq.; mode of levying changed by Nerva, 260; made more oppressive by Hadrian, 294
Teachers, their office in the church, vii. 319; distinct from Apostles, viii. 191 sq.
Teaching, Christ's manner of, vi. 216 sq., 310 sq.
Tebah, a city near Zobah, iii. 153
Tegri (Hegrin), an angel in 'Shepherd of Hermas,' viii. 236
Tekoa, near Bethkerem, iii. 256 *note* 6; wilderness of, in Judah, iv. 55
Tekoa, wise woman of, iii. 173 sq.
Tel-abib, on the Chebar, Ezekiel deported to, iv. 264 *note* 7
Telaim, on the southern frontier of Judah, iii. 37
Telassar, a city, west of the Euphrates, iv. 150 *note* 6
Teliton, v. 391 *note* 6
Tellûzah, site of the ancient Tirzah, iv. 24 *note* 1
Teman, a city of Edom, iv. 192 *note* 2
Temple, David's idea of erecting one at Jerusalem, iii. 129 sq.; accumulates treasures for it, 196, 226, 228
Temple in Egypt. See *Leontopolis*
Temple, Mount of the, iii. 230 *note* 4; besieged and occupied by the Syrians, v. 318; occupied by Nicanor's troops, 321; retaken by the party of Judas Maccabæus, 322; occupied by Jonathan, 327; fortified by Simon, 335; protracted siege of, by Pompey, 400
Temple of Baal, in Samaria, erected by Ahab, iv. 40; destroyed by Jehu, 100 sq.; in Jerusalem, erected by Jehoram, 95; destroyed on the accession of Joash, 136
Temple of Herod, v. 432 sqq.; the eagle over the entrance torn down, 447 sq.; plundered by the Romans, 452
Temple at Jerusalem, Solomon's resolve to erect it, iii. 226; preparations for, 229; labour employed in, 230; site of, 231; foundations and forecourts of,

232, 233, 234; its noiseless erection, 234; timber and stone for, 235; relation of its dimensions to those of the tabernacle, 235; the sacred house (Naos), 235; the porch, 236; the pillars, 237; its outer chambers, 238; its roof, 238; its windows, 239; its doors and decorations, 239; its portico, outer court and gateways, 240; its furniture, 241 sqq.; its grove, 245; length of time of its erection, 245; festival of its dedication, 245 sqq.; importance conferred by it upon Jerusalem, 306; resorted to by subjects of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 25 sq; stripped by the Egyptians in the reign of Rehoboam, 46; stripped by Joash, for tribute to Hazael, 138; arrangements for its repair in the reign of Joash, 139 sq.; its funds, 139 *note* 2, 233; its treasures surrendered on the defeat of Amaziah, 142; upper or northern gate built by Jotham, 166; sacred horses of the sun kept in the outer court by Ahaz, 169; stripped by Ahaz for the Assyrians, 170, 172; by Hezekiah for Sennacherib, 181; its doors, said to have been closed by Ahaz, reopened by Hezekiah, 189; its purification, 189; worship of Astarte introduced into, by Manasseh, 208; its purification by Josiah, 237 sq.; its vessels and treasures carried off by Nabuchodrozzor, 264; destroyed by the Chaldeans, 274; rebuilt under Zerubbabel, v. 100 sqq., 432, 433 *note* 1; the foundations laid, 102; its erection stopped through the intrigues of the Samaritans, 105; resumed in the reign of Darius, 109 sq.; presents sent by the Babylonian Judeans, 111; its completion and consecration, 112; its dimensions, 113; the service reorganised, 113; grants from the royal treasury for the sacrifices, 113 *note* 5; contributions to, from Parthian Judeans, 131 *note* 4; no ark in, 171; the court of the Gentiles added, 173; additions to, by Simon II., 273; gifts to it from heathen princes, 290; attempt of Heliodorus to penetrate into it, 292; robbed by Menelaus, 295; entered by Antiochus, 296 sq.; changed into one of Zeus Olympius, 298; purified by Judeas Maccabæus, 311; changes designed by Alcimus, 325; feast of the consecration of, 380; entered by Pompey, and plundered by Crassus, 400; the treasury of, vi. 360; Solomon's porch, 360; the boy Jesus there, 187; Christ's cleansing of, 254 sq.; veil of, rent at crucifixion, 444; finished according to Herod's plan, vii. 485; general plan of, 585 sq.; its destruction, 601 sq.; great importance of destruction of, viii. 99 sq.; promises and rumours of rebuilding, 18, 277

Temple-guard, vii. 151; Ananus a captain of, 419; another captain, 482

Temple of the Samaritans, v. 213 sqq., 220 sqq.; rebuilt by Herod, 430

Temple-tax, vii. 523

Temple, the second, iii. 232 *note* 4

Temples, for the image-worship of Jahveh, in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, erected by Jeroboam I., iv. 27

Temptation, the history of Christ's, vi. 270 sq.; Christ's to go to the Hellenists, 403 sq.

Ten Commandments. See *Decalogue*

Ten Tribes, kingdom of the. See *Israel*

Ten Tribes, return of the, v. 88 sqq.; predictions about them, 90; traditions of their fate, 91 sqq.; attempts to rediscover them, 92; their descendants in the Crimea, 93 *note* 3, 239 *note* 6; in the northern provinces, 94 sq.

Terah, father of Abraham, i. 273, 334

Teraphim (*Penates*), i. 322, ii. 38

Terebinth, of Tabor, iii. 21; of Deborah, the, iv. 31 *note* 4; of Mamre, the, *ibid.*

Têrôn, a soldier of Herod, intercedes for Alexander and Aristobulus, v. 444

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, book so called, i. 200, 380. See *Patriarchs*

Teucrus of Cyzicus, historical writer, viii. 63

Thaddeus, the Apostle, journeys of, viii. 104. See *Lebbæus*

Thammath Pharathon, fortified by Bacchides, v. 325 *note* 2

Thapsacus, on the Euphrates, iii. 221, 261, iv. 154 *note* 4

Thaumaturgists. See *Magic and Magicians*

Thebes, destruction of, by Carthage, iv. 241 *note* 1

Thekemina, queen of Egypt, said to have been the sister of the wife of Jeroboam I., iv. 32 *note* 1

Thekoa, besieged by Simon, vii. 569

Theocracy in Israel, ii. 1 sq., 145–51; dissolution of pure theocracy, 269 sqq.; its attitude towards the monarchy, iii. 3 sqq.; its reconciliation with the Basileo-Theocracy, 200, 205; its relation to the Messianic hope, iv. 60, 201 sqq.; its struggles against corruption, 236; its relations to monarchy, 288

Theodorus, son of Zeno, attacked by Alexander Jannæus, v. 388; his treasures concealed in Gerasa, 391

Theodosius, a Samaritan disputant in Alexandria, v. 354

Theodotus, author of an epic poem on the history of Shechem, v. 260; probably the same, viii. 62
Theophilus, historical writer, viii. 62
Theophilus, Luke's friend, vii. 33
Theophrastus, a pupil of Aristotle, writes about the Judeans, v. 247
Theos, a king of that name said to have forced his way into the temple, v. 283 *note* 5
Therapeutæ, the, in Egypt, v. 375; their characteristics, 376 sq.
Thermuthis, Egyptian princess, ii. 88
Thessalonica, Paul at, vii. 371 sq.
Thessalonians, second epistle to the, vii. 373; first epistle to, 378
Theudas, pseudo-Messiah, vii. 414
Theudiôn, involved in a conspiracy against Herod, v. 446
Thomas, the Apostle, surnamed Didymus, vi. 303; at the Resurrection, vii. 69 sq.; journeys of, viii. 104
Thrace, Judeans in, v. 239
Thracians, employed as mercenaries by Herod, v. 420
Threx, a fortress near Jericho, v. 401 *note* 7
Tiberias, city, its founding by Antipas, vi. 75; growth of, vii. 265 sq.; given to Agrippa II., 422; indignant thereat, 533; Josephus' escape from, 537; Vespasian enters, 548
Tiberius, legend about in Tertullian, vii. 274
Tibni, set up as a rival to Omri, iv. 37
Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, his conquests, iv. 151; his aid entreated by Ahaz, 160; deportation of Israelites under, 160, 215; receives Ahaz at Damascus, 171; his death, 162; length of his reign, 299 *note* 2
Tigranes, king of Armenia, occupies Syria, and retires again to Armenia, v. 393
Tigranes, Armenian kings descended from Herod, vii. 237, 407
Time, cycles of, viii. 179
Timnath-serah, town, ii. 267, 277
Timotheus, leader of an Ammonite insurrection, v. 313
Timotheus (Timothy), his youth and conversion, vii. 365 sq.; with Paul on his third journey, 387 sq.; imprisoned, 471; death of, viii. 199. See *Pastoral Epistles*
Tiphsah, city of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, conquered by Menahem, iv. 154
Tirhakah, Ethiopian king in southern Egypt, despatches an embassy to Hezekiah, iv. 179; marches from Egypt, 182; his African conquests, 241 *note* 1
Tirthana, place at the foot of Gerîzîm in Samaria, vi. 69

Tirshatha, the, v. 87 sq.; the office apparently in abeyance after the death of Zerubbabel, 118. See *Zerubbabel*
Tirzah, the residence of the kings of the Ten Tribes, iv. 23; Baasha buried in, 35; besieged by Omri, 36; abandoned as a capital by him, 37; rivalled Jerusalem in its beauty, 42; native place of Menahem, 154
Tishbeh, in Gilead, native place of Elijah, iv. 64
Tithes, after destruction of Jerusalem, viii. 44, 267
Titus, Paul's friend and disciple, vii. 345, viii. 109
Titus, Vespasian's son, fetches two legions from Egypt to Palestine, vii. 542 sq.; intercedes with his father for Josephus, 547; takes Gamala and Tarichæa, 548 sq.; sails for Alexandria, 574; besieges Jerusalem, 577 sq.; reverses sustained by him, 588 sq.; energetic prosecution of the siege, 589 sq.; his fierce exasperation at the obstinacy of the besieged, 596 sq.; his wall round Jerusalem, 598 sq.; at the taking of the temple, 603 sq.; his action after the victory, 607 sq.; restores privileges to Judeans of Antioch, viii. 16; his relation to Berenice, 19; his friendship for Josephus, 69, 72
Tob, or Tubin, district, ii. 392, iii. 153
Tobiah, governor of Ammon, v. 153; his anger at the rebuilding of Jerusalem, 154; his league with the Philistines, 155; his secret correspondence with nobles at Jerusalem, 157; a residence in the temple assigned him, 159
Tobias, son of Tobit, v. 210 sq.
Tobias, sons of, the, v. 271, 277
Tobit, a member of the tribe of Naphtali, story of, v. 209 sqq.
Tobit, book of, representations of relations between Israel and the heathen, v. 33 *note* 1, 93, 131; artificial names in, 189 *note* 1; its date and story, 209 sqq., 474 *note* 2; book of Judith compared with, 478
Toi, king of Hamath, iii. 156
Tola, judge, ii. 366, 370
Tongues, gift of, vii. 94 sq.
Tophet, built by Manasseh, iv. 209
Towers, of David, iii. 257; of Solomon, in Antilibanus, 257
Trachoneans, their disturbances in the reign of Herod, v. 440, 442
Trachonitis, assigned to Philip, v. 455 *note* 6
Tradition, its nature, i. 13–45; its multiplication, 16; its sources, 14–31; its stages, 31–41; its committal to writing, 41 sqq.; Arabian tradition, 20,

TRA

33; of the Elders in Philo's works, vii. 210; (Mâssora), in the Rabbinic schools, viii. 42
Trajan, treatment of Christians by, viii. 229 sq.; of Judeans, 274 sq.
Trajan's Day, viii. 280
Transfiguration, of Christ, vi. 353 sq.; John's treatment of, 402 sq.
Treason, nature and guilt of, iii. 6
Trial of Israel in the desert, ii. 195
Tribes of Israel and their subdivisions, i. 363 sqq., ii. 275 sq.; central, 276–83; southern, 283–90; northern, 290–94, 320–24; beyond the Jordan, 294–303, 323–25; settlement of all the tribes, 306–8; their territories, 274–310
Tribes, the Ten, kingdom of. See *Israel*
Trophimus, Ephesian friend of Paul's, vii. 397, 433
Trypho, the opponent of Justin Martyr, viii. 149
Tryphon, a Syrian noble, sets up Alexander Balas as king of Syria, v. 331; invites Jonathan to Beth-sheân, 333; makes him prisoner at Ptolemais, *ibid.*; marches south, followed by Simon, *ibid.*; executes Jonathan, 334; and Antiochus the younger, *ibid.*; defeated by Antiochus Sidêtês, 338
Tubal, probably a designation of Scythian tribes, iv. 229
Tubal-Cain, i. 272 sq.
Tubin, the land of, Judeans in, oppressed by the Ammonites, v. 313
Turbo, Marcius, viii. 273
Twelve, Council of the, retained by Ezra, v. 170
Twelve heads of a community, i. 362 sqq.
Twelve, the Apostles, vi. 299–306; the practical training of, 315 sq.; only one of present at crucifixion, 442; their end, viii. 104 sq.; as distinguished from simple teachers, 191 sq.
Twelve Tribes of Israel, the idea still preserved, v. 86, 95
Types (prototypes) of the nation, i. 288 sqq.
Tyre, Hiram, king of, iii. 226 sq., 277, 292, 297 *note* 2
Tyre, connection of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes with, through the marriage of Ahab and Jezebel, iv. 39; allusion to, in Ps. xlv., 124 *note* 1; attacked by Shalmaneser, 162; ambassadors sent from, to Zedekiah, 268; besieged by Nabuchodrozzor, 270, 277, 300; probably the seat of a Persian governor, v. 88 *note* 2; embassy of Jason to games of Heracles at, 294; its oppression of Judeans in Galilee, 314; Christ's journey thither, vi. 347

VAR

Tyrian chronology, iv. 299 sq.; sailors, employed in transporting timber for the second temple, v. 101
Tyropœon, valley of the, north of Zion, iii. 124, 254 sq., 258, vii. 582 sq.

Unction, the, of the kings, iii. 6, 7, 20, 66, 211, 272
Unity and spirituality of God, ii. 120–23
'Unnamed, the Great,' v. 4 *note* 5, 15 *note* 4, 22; proclaims the mission of Israel to the heathen, 29; looks for the glory of Jerusalem, 32; but not for a Messiah, 36; his prophetic teachings, 42 sqq.; lived in Egypt, 42; completes the prophetic work of the Old Covenant, 43; proclaims the direct interposition of Jahveh, 36, 53; refers to the sacred vessels, 78 *note* 2; anticipations of assistance from the heathen, 79 *note* 3; warnings about the temple, 100. See *Isaiah, book of*
'Upper house of Ahaz,' the, iv. 169
Upright, book of the, iii. 282
Ur of the Chaldees, i. 283 sq.
Uriah the Hittite, a Gibbor, iii. 139 *note* 5; his prowess, 143; his religion, 144 *note* 3; falls before Rabbah, 166
Uriel, of Gibeah, father of Michaiah, iv. 47 *note* 8, 50 *note* 1
Urijah, a prophet of Kirjath-jearim, executed by Jehoiakim, iv. 253
Urijah, high-priest under Ahaz, erects a new altar in the temple court, iv. 171
Urim and Thummim, the, loss of, after the destruction of Jerusalem, v. 85; not restored, 171
Usha (Hûsheh), Galilean town, viii. 288
Usôus, i. 233 sq.
Uz, land, i. 345
Uzza's garden, iii. 273 *note* 5
Uzzah, son of Abinadab, struck dead at the removal of the ark, iii. 126
Uzziah, son of Amaziah, king of Judah, subjugates Edom, iv. 131 *note* 1; conquers Gath, *ibid.*; length of his reign, 118, 143; his foreign campaigns, 143; his leprosy, 145 sq.; his militia and agriculture, 144; his death, 166

Valley of blessing, iv. 56
Valley of Jehoshaphat, iv. 56
Vaphrês, an Egyptian king, iii. 225 *note* 2
Varus, Agrippa II.'s representative, vii. 328, 509
Varus, probably brother of Lysanias, vii. 420 sq.
Varus, Quintilius, governor of Syria, convicts Antipater, v. 447; suppresses

an insurrection at Jerusalem, 452; further proceedings, 453 sq.; called Asuerus, 454 *note* 2
Ventidius, governor of Syria, v. 413
Veronica, supposed to be the woman with issue of blood, vi. 321
Vespasian, arrives at Tyre, vii. 542; in Galilee, 543 sq.; in the south of Palestine, 552 sq.; at the gates of Jerusalem, 572 sq.; leaves Palestine, 573 sq.; his measures for exterminating the Judean State, 612; his kindness towards Josephus, viii. 17; his conquest of Comagene, 31; his death a relief to Judeans, 46, 53; his mode of treating Judeans at last fully adopted, 294
Vessels, the sacred, restored by Cyrus, v. 78; story of their restoration by Darius, 126 sq.
Vine, on coins, v. 340; a golden, presented to Pompey, 398
Violence of prophetism in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 65, 119, 128 sq., 288; of the reforms of Josiah, in Judah, 238 sq.; the danger of monarchy, 288
Virgin, fount of the, at Jerusalem, iii. 254
Virtues, the Four Grecian, in Philo's system, vii. 218, 227
Vitellius, L., Syrian governor, vi. 70, 79, vii. 327
Vologeses, Parthian king, in war with Izates, vii. 406
Volumnius, deputy governor of Syria, sent by Herod to Rome, v. 443
Vow, Nazirite, Paul's action with regard to, vii. 432
Vows, ii. 391 sq.

WÂDI KELT, not to be identified with the brook Cherith, iv. 105 *note* 1
War, booty in, iii. 37, 106; laws of, softened in Deuteronomy, iv. 224; service in, dispensation of Judeans from, vii. 508; Jewish, see *Josephus, Jerusalem*
Wars of Jahveh, book of the. See *Jahveh*
Wars, the, of Saul, iii. 43; of David, 146–60; of Solomon, 216-21
Water, supply of, to Jerusalem, iii. 252 sq.; improved by Hezekiah, iv. 175; flowing near the Synagogues, vii. 308; water and wine at the Lord's Supper, according to Justin Martyr, origin of idea, 124
Widows' Institute, viii. 201
Whitsunday, the first, vii. 88 sq.
Wisdom, book of, iii. 318
Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach, the [Ecclesiasticus], v. 189 sq., 262 sqq.; preface to, 263, 272 *note* 4
Wisdom of Solomon, the, iii. 279, 318; its view of the pre-eminence of *Israel*, v. 459; its date and contents, 479 sqq.
Wisdom or philosophy, progress of, iii. 276 sqq.; pursuit of, in Israel, iv. 19, 115; among the Idumeans, 192; in Judah, 200; relation to the Logos in Philo's system, vii. 216 sq.
Witch of Endor, iii. 51
Woman, her position in Israel, iv. 134; the, taken in adultery, vi. 366
Women, the, of Christ's society, vi. 305
'Word of God,' Messianic name, vi. 116 sq. See *Logos*
Words of Christ not in four Gospels, vi. 218
Works. See *Christian Faith*
Works of Christ, two kinds of, vi. 219 sq. See *Miracles*
Worship of images, ii. 124 sq.
Worship, public, organised by Ezra, v. 145
Writing. See *Character*

XERXES, Egypto-Persian wars under, v. 148 *note* 3
Xylophory, Judean festival, vii. 503
Xystus (Sixtus), sixth Roman bishop, viii. 247; Proverbs of, 247–50

YEMEN, settlement of Judeans in, viii. 15, 274

ZAB, river, between Adiabene and Nineveh, iv. 150
Zabadeans, a tribe in the Arabian desert, conquered by Jonathan, v. 332
'Zabulon, the men of,' vii. 511
Zacchæus, rich tax-gatherer at Jericho, vi. 388
Zachariah, son of Jeroboam II., king of Israel, iv. 118, 133
Zadok, appointed high-priest with Abiathar, iii. 134; offers to accompany David on his flight, 180; sent to conciliate Judah after Absalom's death, 190; supports Solomon's claim, 209; his house receives the high-priesthood alone, 213; and retains it, 268
Zadok, founder of the school of Sadducees, v. 275
Zair (in 2 Kings viii. 20–22), probably identical with Zoar, iv. 94, *note* 4
Zamzummim, nation, i. 229
Zara, v. 391 *note* 6
Zarathustrian religion, the, its nature, v. 39 sq.; effect of, on Jahveism, 183 sqq., 188 sq.
Zarepath, a city of Sidon, iv. 68, 105
Zarthan, in the Jordan valley, iii. 235

Zealots, and Zealots of the Law, vi. 49 sq.; Simon, son of Gamaliel, model of, vii. 194; Paul one of them, 280; rapid ascendency of, towards end of Apostolic age, 488 sq.; as conspirators, 499 sq.; the party of learned Zealots, 559 sq.; their degeneracy, 567; the rise of the popular Zealots, 568 sq.; of the priestly Zealots, 574 sq.; their massacre at Jerusalem, 590; and at Machærus, 614 sq.; end of their reign, viii. 4 sq., 24 sq.; return to their methods, 266
Zebedee, the father of James and John, vi. 181 sq.
Zeboim, valley of, iii. 33
Zebulon, tribe, ii. 290, 292
Zechariah, prophet of Judah under Uzziah, iv. 144; his address to the Judean residents in Babylon, v. 129; his prophetic power, 175; influence of Zarathustrian ideas upon, 185, 188; his style, 188; as Messianic prophet, vi. 108 sq., 394
Zechariah, book of, ix.–xi., prophetic author of, vol. iv. 5, 14 *note* 1, 132, 157, 161 *note* 2, 174; xii.–xiii. 6, xiv., 272 *note* 1, 279; i. 7–vi. 8, vol. v. 111 *note* 2, 184 *note* 1
Zechariah, son of the high priest Jehoiada, stoned in the temple, iv. 141
Zedekiah, a prophet, executed by Nabuchodrozzor, iv. 269 *note* 3
Zedekiah (Mattaniah), son of Josiah, king of Judah, placed on the throne by Nabuchodrozzor, iv. 265; position of parties in his reign, 266, 267; his incapacity, 268; visits Babylon, 268; contemplates revolt, 269; his rebellion, 270; consults Jeremiah, 272; his flight and capture, 274; carried to Riblah, 274; and thence to Babylon, 274
Zedekiah, son of Chenaanah, a prophet of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, iv. 76; promises Ahab success against Ramoth Gilead, 76
Zelah, family tomb of Saul at, iii. 137
Zelek, an Ammonite, iii. 144 *note* 3
Zemaraim, the northernmost point of the territory of Judah, iv. 48
Zeno, governor of Philadelphia, v. 343; was the father of Theodorus, 388 *note* 4; read Zeno's son for, in Jos. *Antiq.* xv., 391 *note* 5
Zenodorus, in possession of the greater part of the principality of Lysanias, v. 436
Zephaniah, a prophet of Judah, his survey of foreign affairs, iv. 198 *note* 1; his ministry, 232; his language, 279
Zephaniah, book of, iv. 207 *note* 3, 219 sq., 230

Zephathah, defeat of the Ethiopians at, by Asa, iv. 50
Zerah, the Ethiopian, his campaign against Asa, iv. 50 sq.
Zered, river, the southern boundary of the kingdom of Israel, iv. 4 *note* 1; southern boundary of Moab, the allied kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom at, 88
Zereda, in Ephraim, native place of Jeroboam, iii. 304
Zezin, site of the ancient Jezreel, iv. 40
Zerubbabel, a Chaldean name, v. 33 *note* 2
Zerubbabel, his family, v. 83 sq.; his name and titles, 83 *note* 5, 87, 88 *note* 1; his position on his first arrival at Jerusalem, 86; his duties as Tirshatha, 87; contributes largely to the building of the temple, 100; falls into disgrace, 107; addressed by Haggai, 109, 111; and referred to by Zechariah, 111; uncertainty as to the date of his death, 117; Messianic hopes gather round him, 117; later views of, 125; no descendant filled his office of Tirshatha, 118; tradition of his return to Babylon, 118 *note* 8; his descendants, *ibid.*; probable calamities of his later years, 120; may be the author of Ps. cxxxii., *ibid.*; probably the author of Ps. cxxxviii., 125; living at the consecration of the temple, *ibid.*; story of the way in which he obtained from Darius the restoration of the sacred vessels, 126 sq.; apocalypse of, by a Rabbinical writer, 128; various traditions about him incorporated by Josephus, 128 *note* 3; temple of, 432, 433 *note* 1
Zeruiah, sister of David, mother of Joab, Abishai, and Asahel, iii. 113
Zeus, temples at Jerusalem and on Gerizim dedicated to, v. 298
Zibah, house steward of Saul, iii. 135; brings David a present on his flight, 181; does homage to David, 190; divides Saul's estates with Mephibosheth, 191
Ziklag, a Philistine city, David's settlement at, iii. 101; sacked by the Amalekites, 104; its history, iv. 3 *note* 3
Zimri, assassinates Elah, iv. 35; becomes king of the Ten Tribes, 36; besieged in Tirzah by Omri, 36; perishes in his burning palace, 24, 36
Zin, desert, ii. 193 sq.
Zion, i.e. dry mountain, iii. 121, 123, 125, 163, 221, 254, 273, 288, 304; David's grave upon, 203, 228 *note* 1; quarters of the high-priest on, 248; arsenal on, 250 *note* 1; fortification of, by Solomon, 258 sq.
Ziph, wilderness of, south-east of Hebron, iii. 92, 93

ZOA

Zoan. See *Tanis*
Zoar, city, i. 314
Zobah, Saul's wars with the kings of, iii. 43; kingdom of, 150; its situation, 152 sq.; remains faithful to David in Absalom's rebellion, 184; bronze acquired in the conquest of, 229
Zobaiba, not to be identified with Zobah, iii. 154 *note* 2
Zodiac, the first mention of the signs of, iv. 169

ZUP

Zôilus, an upstart prince, attacked by Alexander Jannæus, v. 387
Zoolatry, ii. 58
Zorah, city of Judah, iv. 2 *note* 2
Zoroaster. See *Zarathustrian Religion*
Zoroastrian religions, introduced into Judah under Ahaz, iv. 169; and under Zedekiah, 268
Zorobabel, Hellenistic form of Zerubbabel, v. 83 *note* 5
Zuph, land of, iii. 19 *note* 3

THE END.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

00110735

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 31 October, 2019